arXiv:math/0404455v2 [math.DG] 26 May 2006

VOLUME RENORMALIZATION FOR COMPLETE EINSTEIN–KÄHLER METRICS

NEIL SESHADRI

ABSTRACT. For a strictly pseudoconvex domain in a complex manifold we define a renormalized volume with respect to the approximately Einstein complete Kähler metric of Fefferman. We compute the conformal anomaly in complex dimension two and apply the result to derive a renormalized Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula. Relations between renormalized volume and the CR Q-curvature are also investigated.

1. INTRODUCTION

There has been much recent activity in the area of conformal geometry centred around volume renormalisation. In this note we demonstrate that a similar notion of volume renormalisation exists in CR geometry and obtain some explicit formulae, including a renormalised Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula, in complex dimension two.

The quantity in conformal geometry known as renormalised volume was first defined by Henningson–Skenderis [HS98] and Graham [Gra00] in their studies of conformally compact Einstein manifolds. A conformally compact (Einstein) manifold consists of a compact manifold-with-boundary $\overline{X}$ and an (Einstein) metric g_+ on the interior X satisfying the condition that $\varphi^2 g_+$ extends at least continuously to the boundary M, where φ is a defining function for M, i.e., $\varphi < 0$ on X and $\varphi = 0, d\varphi \neq 0$ on M. The restriction of $\varphi^2 g_+$ to TM rescales upon changing φ whence defining a conformal class of metrics $[g]$ on M. Fefferman–Graham [FG85] called g_+ the Poincaré metric associated to the conformal manifold $(M, [g])$. The volume of (X, g_+) is infinite; but one can renormalise it by considering the expansion, in powers of a special defining function, of the volume of the set $\{\varphi < \varepsilon\}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. The constant term in this asymptotic expansion, called the renormalised volume, is an invariant of the metric g_+, provided M is odd-dimensional. If M is even-dimensional, the renormalised volume is dependent on the choice of representative g; however in this case there is a log term in the volume expansion whose coefficient turns out to be an invariant of g_+. The difference between the renormalised volumes corresponding to two different choices of conformal representative in the even-dimensional case is known as the conformal anomaly. It is the boundary integral of a nonlinear partial differential operator applied to the conformal scale.

To explore an analogous notion in CR geometry, let M be a compact strictly pseudoconvex $(2n+1)$-dimensional CR manifold embedded into a complex $(n+1)$-manifold X, with natural CR structure coming from the embedding. There is conformal class of pseudohermitian Levi metrics on M, the "pseudo" coming from the fact that they only act on a certain subbundle of TM. Each Levi metric in this conformal class corresponds to a contact one-form called a pseudohermitian structure. Consider the complete Kähler metric g_+ with Kähler form

$$\omega = \partial\overline{\partial}\log\left(-\frac{1}{\rho}\right) = -\frac{\partial\overline{\partial}\rho}{\rho} + \frac{\partial\rho\wedge\overline{\partial}\rho}{\rho^2},$$

for any sufficiently smooth defining function ρ. If $\mathcal{H}_\rho$ denotes the bundle whose fibre over each $M_\rho^\varepsilon := \{\rho = \varepsilon\}$ is $\mathcal{H}_\rho^\varepsilon$, the holomorphic tangent bundle to M_ρ^ε, then $\rho g_+|_{\mathcal{H}_\rho^\varepsilon}$ extends continuously to M and

$$\rho g_+|_{\mathcal{H}_\rho^0} \in (\text{conformal class of Levi metrics on } M).$$

Thus g_+ provides a CR-geometric analogue of a conformally compact metric. Fefferman [Fef76] produced a ρ that locally solves a certain Monge–Ampére type initial-value problem. For this ρ, g_+ is approximately Einstein near M, i.e., satisfies

$$\text{Ricci form of } g_+ = -(n+2)\omega + O(\rho^{n+1}).$$

Remark that in the special case where X is a Stein manifold, the existence and uniqueness of a complete Einstein–Kähler metric, asymptotic to Fefferman's approximately Einstein metric, is given by Cheng–Yau [CY80]. By applying techniques from the conformal setting we obtain an asymptotic expansion for Fefferman's approximately Einstein metric in powers of a special defining function φ with coefficients pseudohermitian invariants of the chosen pseudohermitian representative. We can extend Fefferman's approximately Einstein metric to an Hermitian metric over the whole of X and then consider the asymptotic expansion of the volume of the set $\{\varphi < \varepsilon\}$:

$$c_0\varepsilon^{-n-1} + c_1\varepsilon^{-n} + \cdots + c_n\varepsilon^{-1} + L\log(-\varepsilon) + V + o(1). \tag{1.1}$$

The constant term V is defined to be the renormalised volume. The coefficients c_j and L are integrals over M of local pseudohermitian invariants of the chosen pseudohermitian representative, with L being independent of this choice. While we shall illustrate the volume renormalisation procedure in general dimension, it turns out that obtaining explicit formulae seems to be a computationally infeasible task (by hand) except in the lowest dimension. Restricting attention to the $n = 1$ case gives our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M be a smooth compact strictly pseudoconvex CR manifold of dimension three that forms the boundary of a complex manifold X. Let g_+ be Fefferman's approximately Einstein metric on X near M. Let θ and $\widehat{\theta} = e^{2\Upsilon}\theta$ be two pseudohermitian structures on M. Then the conformal anomaly of the renormalised volumes $V_\theta, V_{\widehat{\theta}}$ of (X, g_+) with respect to $\theta, \widehat{\theta}$, respectively, is*

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\widehat{\theta}} - V_\theta = \int_M \frac{1}{96}\left(\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} - 8\mathrm{Im}A_{11,}{}^{11}\right)\Upsilon + \frac{1}{16}\mathrm{Scal}\Upsilon_1\Upsilon^1 \\ - \frac{1}{4}\Big((\Upsilon_1\Upsilon^1)^2 + \mathrm{Im}(\Upsilon_1\Upsilon_1A^{11}) + \frac{1}{4}(\Upsilon_T)^2 \\ - 2\mathrm{Re}(\Upsilon_{11}\Upsilon^1\Upsilon^1) + \Upsilon_1\Upsilon^1\Delta_b\Upsilon\Big)\,\theta\wedge d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Here Scal *and* A_{11} *denote the pseudohermitian scalar curvature and torsion of* (M, θ), Δ_b *is the sublaplacian and the subscripts* 1 *and* T *denote pseudohermitian covariant differentiation in the directions of the CR structure and characteristic vector field, respectively. Indices are raised with the Levi metric of* θ.

Furthermore, in the volume expansion (1.1), $L = 0$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 rests largely on computing the asymptotic expansion for g_+ in the form mentioned above. The tool for this purpose is the ambient connection of Graham–Lee [GL88], which is an extension of the pseudohermitian connection inside the boundary. The natural coframe used in [GL88] is one that restricts to an admissible coframe on each pseudohermitian manifold of a foliation near the boundary. However, with the strategy of simplifying Einstein equation calculations by putting g_+ into a diagonal form, we find that we must modify this frame; that constitutes the main technical step.

As a rather straightforward consequence, via some basic invariant theory, of Theorem 1.1 we prove a renormalised Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula.

Corollary 1.2. *Let* M *be a smooth compact strictly pseudoconvex CR manifold of dimension three that forms the boundary of a complete Einstein–Kähler manifold* (X, g_{EK}). *Then*

$$\chi(X) = \int_X \left(c_2 - \frac{1}{3}{c_1}^2\right) + \mathcal{V}(M),$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}(M) := \frac{1}{\pi^2}\left(6V - \frac{1}{128}\int_M (\mathrm{Scal})^2 - 16|A|^2\ \theta\wedge d\theta\right)$$

is a global CR invariant.

Anderson [And01] has obtained an analogous formula for conformally compact four-manifolds. Of course in that setting there is no boundary error term since the renormalised volume itself is conformally invariant. Now if the CR manifold M is the boundary of a domain in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ then from work of Burns–Epstein [BE90] we have that

$$\chi(X) = \int_X \left(c_2 - \frac{1}{3}{c_1}^2\right) - \mu(M),$$

where $\mu(M)$ is the Burns–Epstein global CR invariant of [BE88]. So in this case, $\mathcal{V}(M) = -\mu(M)$.

We remark that Herzlich [Her] (see also [BH05]) has recently defined a renormalised volume and obtained a renormalised Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula for real four-dimensional generalisations of our approximately Einstein complete Kähler manifolds, called almost complex hyperbolic Einstein (ACHE) manifolds. His formulation, though, differs from ours somewhat[1] and as a consequence the explicit formulae obtained there do not coincide with ours.

---

[1] The main difference being in the choice of defining function. He also uses a different constant in the Einstein equation.

The special defining function we use, namely, the unique solution to the boundary-value problem

$$\frac{i}{2}(\overline{\partial}\varphi - \partial\varphi)|_M = \theta \ ; \quad |\partial(\log(-\varphi))|^2_{g_+} = 1,$$

has its motivation in the relation provided by Fefferman [Fef76] between a CR manifold M and an even-dimensional conformal structure living on a canonical circle bundle over M. In fact our defining function φ is the (negative of the) square of the special defining function associated to Fefferman's conformal manifold.

Fefferman's relation between CR geometry and conformal geometry also provided the means ([FH03]) for defining the CR Q-curvature Q_θ^{CR} from that concept in conformal geometry. In general even-dimensional conformal geometry, Fefferman–Graham [FG02] showed that the integral of the Q-curvature of the boundary is a constant multiple of the coefficient of the log term in the volume expansion of the interior manifold with respect to the Poincaré metric. Analogously, in the CR case we shall see that

$$\int_M Q_\theta^{\mathrm{CR}} = \text{const.}\, L. \tag{1.2}$$

It was shown by Fefferman–Hirachi [FH03] that when $n = 1$, $\int_M Q_\theta^{\mathrm{CR}} = 0$. So (1.2) verifies the last statement in Theorem 1.1. It is worth mentioning, however, that although the statment regarding L in Theorem 1.1 is proved by integrating a divergence term (see § 5), this divergence term is *not* a constant multiple of Q_θ^{CR}, since it does not satisfy the appropriate (see [FH03]) transformation law under change in pseudohermitian structure.

The analogy between CR geometry and conformal geometry breaks down when one considers the obstruction to determining the high-order expansions for the respective metrics g_+. It was shown in [Fef76] that the obstruction to obtaining a smooth complete Einstein–Kähler metric is a scalar function. We verify this fact by showing that the trace, with respect to the chosen representative Levi metric, of the φ^{n+1} coefficient in the asymptotic expansion for g_+ is formally *un*determined, while the trace-free part of this coefficient is formally determined. This is in contrast to the even-dimensional conformal setting ([Gra00]) where the obstruction first occurs in determining the trace-free part of the conformally compact metric.

Layout of the paper. In § 2 we review the basics of pseudohermitian geometry and introduce the ambient connection of Graham–Lee. In § 3 we fix a special defining function and suitable coframe, compute the Levi-Civita connection and Ricci form and describe, in general dimension, how to determine our desired expansion for g_+ from the Einstein equation. In § 4 we define the renormalised volume and conformal anomaly and show that the log term coefficient is an invariant of Fefferman's approximately Einstein metric. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is the content of § 5 and Corollary 1.2 is proved in § 6. It is illustrative to see how the whole procedure works for a concrete example, so we devote § 7 to explicit calculations for the Bergman metric on the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^2$. We confine to the Appendix a discussion of CR Q-curvature and the proof of formula (1.2).

Notations. Lowercase Greek indices run from 1 to n and, unless otherwise indicated, lowercase Latin indices run from 0 to n. The letter i will denote the quantity $\sqrt{-1}$. We observe the summation convention.

Acknowledgements. This work was part of the author's Master's thesis at the University of Tokyo. I am deeply indebted to my supervisor Professor Kengo Hirachi for suggesting this particular problem to work on and for his constant support and advice. I also thank Professor Robin Graham for useful conversations and the referee for suggestions for improvement to an earlier draft. Part of this project was carried out at the University of Adelaide, whose mathematics department I thank for their hospitality. Financial support through the Japanese Ministry of Education research scholarship is gratefully acknowledged.

2. Pseudohermitian geometry

2.1. **Pseudohermitian manifolds.**

Recall some standard notions from pseudohermitian geometry, as contained in, e.g., [Lee88]. A *CR structure* (of hypersurface type) on a real $(2n+1)$-dimensional manifold M is an n-dimensional complex subbundle, also called the *holomorphic tangent bundle*, $\mathcal{H}^M \subset \mathbb{C}TM$ satisfying $\mathcal{H}^M \cap \overline{\mathcal{H}^M} = \{0\}$ and $[\mathcal{H}^M, \mathcal{H}^M] \subset \mathcal{H}^M$. A global nonvanishing section θ of the real line bundle $E \subset T^*M$ of annihilators of $H^M := \operatorname{Re} \mathcal{H}^M \oplus \overline{\mathcal{H}^M}$ exists if and only if E is orientable; since H^M is naturally oriented by its complex structure, such a θ exists if and only if M is orientable. If a θ exists then clearly it is determined by the CR structure only up to conformal multiple. If the Hermitian bilinear *Levi form* of θ defined by $L_\theta(V, \overline{W}) := -2id\theta(V \wedge \overline{W})$ on $\mathcal{H}^M$ is definite we say that θ is a *pseudohermitian structure* (or *contact form*), and that M is *strictly pseudoconvex* with respect to θ. A CR manifold with a fixed pseudohermitian structure is called a *pseudohermitian manifold.* Given a pseudohermitian manifold (M, θ), by the nondegeneracy of the Levi form on $\mathcal{H}^M$, $d\theta$ has precisely one null direction transverse to $\mathcal{H}^M$ whence there is a uniquely defined real vector field T, called the *characteristic vector field* of θ, that satisfies

$$T \lrcorner\, d\theta = 0; \quad \theta(T) = 1,$$

as in [Lee86]. A complex-valued q-form μ is said to be of type $(q, 0)$ if $\overline{\mathcal{H}^M} \lrcorner\, \mu = 0$, and of type $(0, q)$ if $\mathcal{H}^M \lrcorner\, \mu = 0$. An *admissible coframe* on an open set of M is a set of complex $(1,0)$-forms $\{\theta^\alpha\} = \{\theta^1, \dots, \theta^n\}$ that satisfy $\theta^\alpha(T) = 0$ and whose restriction to $\mathcal{H}^M$ forms a basis for $(\mathcal{H}^M)^*$.

The pseudohermitian manifolds we deal with in this note will be smooth compact CR manifolds of dimension $2n+1$ embedded into a complex manifold X of complex dimension $n+1$, with the natural CR structure $\mathcal{H}^M = T_{1,0}X \cap \mathbb{C}TM$ and the pseudohermitian structure $\theta = (i/2)(\overline{\partial}\varphi - \partial\varphi)|_M$, where φ is a defining function for M. Here and throughout this note the pullback of forms via the inclusion of M into X is denoted by restriction $|_M$. The region $\{\varphi < 0\}$ enclosed by M will also be denoted by X. We shall assume that the Levi form of θ is *positive* definite.

2.2. **The ambient connection of Graham–Lee.**

There is a canonical connection on M defined by Tanaka [Tan75] and Webster [Web78] which, along with its curvature and torsion tensors, will be called the *pseudohermitian connection*, respectively, *pseudohermitian curvature*, *pseudohermitian torsion*. Now follows an exposition of the work of Graham–Lee [GL88] in extending the pseudohermitian connection to a family of hypersurfaces that foliate a one-sided neighbourhood of M.

Let $\overline{U} = U \cup M$ be a one-sided neighbourhood of M where, for an arbitrary defining function φ for $M = M^0$, each level set $M^\varepsilon := \{z : \varphi(z) = \varepsilon\}$ is strictly pseudoconvex with the natural CR structure $\mathcal{H}^\varepsilon := T_{1,0}\overline{U} \cap \mathbb{C}TM^\varepsilon$ and pseudohermitian structure $(i/2)(\overline{\partial}\varphi - \partial\varphi)|_{M^\varepsilon}$. Let $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{C}T\overline{U}$ denote the bundle whose fibre over each M^ε is $\mathcal{H}^\varepsilon$. Setting $\vartheta := (i/2)(\overline{\partial}\varphi - \partial\varphi)$, the restriction of $i\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi = d\vartheta$ to $\mathcal{H}$ is positive definite. This means $\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi$ has precisely one null direction transverse to $\mathcal{H}$, whence there is a uniquely defined $(1,0)$ vector field ξ that satisfies

$$\xi \perp_{\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi} \mathcal{H}; \quad \partial\varphi(\xi) = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

Define a real-valued function $r := 2\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi(\xi \wedge \overline{\xi})$ and call it the *transverse curvature* of φ. Let $\{W_\alpha\} = \{W_1, \ldots, W_n\}$ be any local frame for $\mathcal{H}$. Since ξ is transverse to $\mathcal{H}$, the set of vector fields $\{W_\alpha, \xi\}$ is a local frame for $T_{1,0}\overline{U}$. The dual $(1,0)$ coframe is then of the form $\{\vartheta^\alpha, \partial\varphi\}$ for some $(1,0)$-forms $\{\vartheta^\alpha\}$ that annihilate ξ. From the definitions of ξ and r we may write

$$\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi = h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\vartheta^\alpha \wedge \vartheta^{\overline{\beta}} + r\partial\varphi \wedge \overline{\partial}\varphi, \tag{2.2}$$

for a positive definite Hermitian matrix of functions $h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$. We will use $h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ and its inverse $h^{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ to raise and lower indices in the usual way. Since

$$d\vartheta = i\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi = ih_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\vartheta^\alpha \wedge \vartheta^{\overline{\beta}} + rd\varphi \wedge \vartheta, \tag{2.3}$$

the Levi form is given by

$$L_\vartheta(X, \overline{Y}) = -2id\vartheta(X \wedge \overline{Y}) = h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}X^\alpha Y^{\overline{\beta}},$$

for $X = X^\alpha W_\alpha, Y = Y^\beta W_\beta \in \mathcal{H}$. Writing

$$\xi = N - \frac{i}{2}T \tag{2.4}$$

with N and T real, it follows that T is tangential to each M^ε and that $T \lrcorner\, d\vartheta = 0$ and $\vartheta(T) = 1$. Thus on each M^ε, T is the characteristic vector field of ϑ and the restriction of $\{\vartheta^\alpha\}$ is an admissible coframe. The pseudohermitian connection on each M^ε, denoted here by ∇^ε, is defined in [Web78] by the relations

$$\nabla^\varepsilon W_\alpha = {\omega_\alpha}^\beta \otimes W_\beta\,, \quad \nabla^\varepsilon T = 0\,;$$

$$d\vartheta^\beta = \vartheta^\alpha \wedge {\omega_\alpha}^\beta + \vartheta \wedge \tau^\beta\,, \quad \tau^\beta = A^\beta{}_{\overline{\alpha}}\vartheta^{\overline{\alpha}}\,, \quad \omega_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} + \omega_{\overline{\beta}\alpha} = dh_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\,,$$

for a matrix of one-forms ${\omega_\alpha}^\beta$ and a symmetric matrix of functions $A_{\alpha\beta}$ on M^ε. We extend ${\omega_\alpha}^\beta$ and τ^β uniquely to smooth one-forms on $\overline{U}$ by declaring ${\omega_\alpha}^\beta(N) = \tau^\beta(N) = 0$.

Graham–Lee proceed to define a connection, called the *ambient connection*, on $\overline{U}$ that restricts to the pseudohermitian connection on each M^ε.

Proposition 2.1 ([GL88, Proposition 1.1]). *With $\overline{U}$ and φ as above, there exists a unique linear connection ∇ on $\overline{U}$ with the properties:*
(a) *For any vector fields X and Y on $\overline{U}$ that are tangent to some M^{ε}, $\nabla_X Y = \nabla^{\varepsilon}_X Y$, where ∇^{ε} is the pseudohermitian connection on M^{ε}.*
(b) *∇ preserves $\mathcal{H}, N, T$ and L_{ϑ}.*
(c) *Let $\{W_\alpha\}$ be any frame for $\mathcal{H}$ and $\{\vartheta^\alpha, \partial\varphi\}$ the $(1,0)$ coframe dual to $\{W_\alpha, \xi\}$. The connection one-forms ${\varphi_\alpha}^\beta$, defined by $\nabla W_\alpha = {\varphi_\alpha}^\beta \otimes W_\beta$, satisfy the following structure equation:*

$$d\vartheta^\alpha = \vartheta^\beta \wedge {\varphi_\beta}^\alpha - i\partial\varphi \wedge \tau^\alpha + iW^\alpha r d\varphi \wedge \vartheta + \frac{1}{2} r d\varphi \wedge \vartheta^\alpha. \tag{2.5}$$

The components of successive covariant derivatives of a tensor with respect to ∇ will appear as subscripts preceded by a comma, e.g., $A_{\alpha\beta,\overline{\gamma}\delta}$. For a scalar function the comma will be omitted. Of course covariant derivatives of a tensor in the direction W_α or $W_{\overline{\alpha}}$ can be interpreted as either referring to the pseudohermitian connection or the ambient connection. Covariant differentiation in the direction $W_0 := \xi$ shall be written in components as, e.g., $A_{\alpha\beta,0} = A_{\alpha\beta,N} - (i/2)A_{\alpha\beta,T}$.

Proposition 2.2 ([GL88, Proposition 1.2]). *The curvature forms ${\Omega_\alpha}^\beta = d{\varphi_\alpha}^\beta - {\varphi_\alpha}^\gamma \wedge {\varphi_\gamma}^\beta$ are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} {\Omega_\alpha}^\beta \quad = \quad & {R_\alpha}^\beta{}_{\rho\overline{\gamma}} \vartheta^\rho \wedge \vartheta^{\overline{\gamma}} + i\vartheta_\alpha \wedge \tau^\beta - i\tau_\alpha \wedge \vartheta^\beta \\ & + i{A_{\alpha\gamma,}}^\beta \vartheta^\gamma \wedge \overline{\partial}\varphi + iA^\beta{}_{\overline{\gamma},\alpha} \vartheta^{\overline{\gamma}} \wedge \partial\varphi \\ & + d\varphi \wedge (r_\alpha \vartheta^\beta - r^\beta \vartheta_\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\delta^\beta_\alpha r_\gamma \vartheta^\gamma - \frac{1}{2}\delta^\beta_\alpha r_{\overline{\gamma}} \vartheta^{\overline{\gamma}}) \\ & + d\varphi \wedge \frac{i}{2}({r_\alpha}^\beta + r^\beta{}_\alpha + 2A_{\alpha\gamma}A^{\gamma\beta})\vartheta\, , \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where ${R_\alpha}^\beta{}_{\rho\overline{\gamma}}$ agree with the components of the pseudohermitian curvature tensor.

For later use we define the real *sublaplacian* on a function f by

$$\Delta_b f := -({f_\alpha}^\alpha + {f_{\overline{\beta}}}^{\overline{\beta}}).$$

We will also use a *divergence formula* for pseudohermitian manifolds, which we state here for reference. For a $(1,0)$-form $\mu = \mu_\alpha \theta^\alpha$ on M, an application of Stokes' theorem to the $2n$-form $\theta \wedge \mu \wedge (d\theta)^{n-1}$ yields the formula

$$\int_M {\mu_{\alpha,}}^\alpha \; \theta \wedge (d\theta)^n = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

3. The Einstein equation

3.1. **Choice of defining function and frame.** Given any defining function φ for M we may identify (a possible shrinkage of) $\overline{U}$ with $M \times (\delta, 0]$, $\delta < 0$, with φ as a coordinate on the second factor. Indeed, identify $\overline{U}$ with $M \times (\delta, 0]$ by the map F that takes (p, t) to the point in $\overline{U}$ obtained by following the unit-speed integral curve $\gamma^p(t)$ of the vector field N, emanating from a point p on M, for time t. The remaining assertion is equivalent to the statement that $\gamma^p(t) \in \{\varphi = t\} = M^t$, which follows from the fact that $N\varphi = 1$.

Specifying a defining function φ for M determines a pseudohermitian structure θ for M such that $\theta = (i/2)(\overline{\partial}\varphi - \partial\varphi)|_M$. In the other direction though, the boundary equation

$$\frac{i}{2}(\overline{\partial}\varphi - \partial\varphi)|_M = \theta, \tag{3.1}$$

for a specified pseudohermitian structure θ, clearly determines φ only mod $O(\varphi^2)$. (Throughout this note $O(\varphi^k)$ will denote functions smoothly divisible by φ^k.) However if there is a certain form of complete Kähler metric on U, then φ can be uniquely determined as follows. For any fixed sufficiently smooth defining function ρ with $\rho < 0$ in U, consider the Kähler metric g_+ with Kähler form

$$\omega = \partial\overline{\partial}\log\left(-\frac{1}{\rho}\right) = -\frac{\partial\overline{\partial}\rho}{\rho} + \frac{\partial\rho \wedge \overline{\partial}\rho}{\rho^2}. \tag{3.2}$$

If we write our desired defining function φ as $\varphi = e^{2f}\rho$, for a function f, then using (2.2),

$$\omega = -\frac{1}{\varphi}h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\vartheta^\alpha \wedge \vartheta^{\overline{\beta}} + \frac{1 - r\varphi}{\varphi^2}\partial\varphi \wedge \overline{\partial}\varphi + 2\partial\overline{\partial}f. \tag{3.3}$$

This formula implies that

$$|\partial(\log(-\varphi))|^2_{g_+} = 1 + O(\varphi).$$

(Our convention is that a Kähler metric $g_{i\overline{j}}\vartheta^i\vartheta^{\overline{j}}$ has Kähler form $g_{i\overline{j}}\vartheta^i \wedge \vartheta^{\overline{j}}$.) Then in analogy with the conformal case, we choose a special defining function φ according to the following lemma, whose proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.1 in [Gra00].

Lemma 3.1. *A choice of pseudohermitian structure θ on M determines a unique defining function φ in a neighbourhood of M such that*

$$\frac{i}{2}(\overline{\partial}\varphi - \partial\varphi)|_M = \theta \ ; \quad |\partial(\log(-\varphi))|^2_{g_+} = 1.$$

Proof. As before write $\varphi = e^{2f}\rho$ for a function f to be determined. The boundary value of f is determined by the condition $(i/2)(\overline{\partial}\varphi - \partial\varphi)|_M = \theta$. Next

$$|\partial(\log(-\varphi))|^2_{g_+} = |\partial(\log(-\rho))|^2_{g_+} + \frac{4}{\rho}\mathrm{Re}\langle\partial\rho, \partial f\rangle_{g_+} + 4|\partial f|^2_{g_+}.$$

If N_ρ denotes the real part of the vector field that solves (2.1) with the defining function ρ, then from (3.2) and (2.2) (for the defining function ρ) the equation above becomes

$$|\partial(\log(-\varphi))|^2_{g_+} = \frac{1}{\rho^2}|\partial\rho|^2_{g_+} + \frac{4\rho}{1 - r\rho}N_\rho f + 4|\partial f|^2_{g_+}.$$

The condition $|\partial(\log(-\varphi))|^2_{g_+} = 1$ is equivalent to

$$N_\rho f + \frac{(1 - r\rho)}{\rho}|\partial f|^2_{g_+} = \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{\rho^2}|\partial\rho|^2_{g_+})(1 - r\rho)}{4\rho}.$$

The numerator of the right-hand side is $O(\rho)$. Moreover the second term on the left-hand side is $O(1)$ with the coefficient of $(N_\rho f)^2$ being $O(\rho)$. Therefore we have a noncharacteristic first-order PDE for f and a unique solution near M with the prescribed boundary condition. $\square$

Hereafter φ will denote the special defining function produced by Lemma 3.1.

We want to find $(1,0)$-forms $\{\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha\}$ so that, keeping Lemma 3.1 in mind, the metric g_+ has the diagonal Kähler form

$$\omega = -\frac{1}{\varphi}\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha \wedge \widetilde{\vartheta}^{\overline{\beta}} + \frac{1}{\varphi^2}\partial\varphi \wedge \overline{\partial}\varphi, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ is a positive definite Hermitian matrix of functions, parameterised by φ. To construct the desired forms, first take the unique vector field $\widetilde{\xi}$ of type $(1,0)$ that satisfies

$$\widetilde{\xi} \perp_{g_+} \mathcal{H}; \quad \partial\varphi(\widetilde{\xi}) = 1.$$

Thus $\{W_\alpha, \widetilde{\xi}\}$ is a local frame for $T_{1,0}U$. The dual $(1,0)$ coframe is then of the form $\{\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha, \partial\varphi\}$ for some $(1,0)$ forms $\{\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha\}$ on U that annihilate $\widetilde{\xi}$. We may write

$$\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha = \vartheta^\alpha + a^\alpha\partial\varphi$$

and

$$\widetilde{\xi} = \xi - a^\alpha W_\alpha$$

for some uniquely determined functions a^α on U.

Lemma 3.2. *The functions a^α extend continuously to M with $a^\alpha|_M = 0$. Consequently, the vector field $\widetilde{\xi}$, the forms $\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha$ and the tensor $\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ have continuous extensions to M with $\widetilde{\xi}|_M = \xi|_M, \widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha|_M = \vartheta^\alpha|_M$ and $\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M = h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M$.*

Proof. Using (3.4) and (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = 2\omega(\widetilde{\xi} \wedge W_{\overline{\beta}}) &= 2\omega(\xi \wedge W_{\overline{\beta}}) - 2a^\alpha\omega(W_\alpha \wedge W_{\overline{\beta}}) \\ &= 4\partial\overline{\partial}f(\xi \wedge W_{\overline{\beta}}) - 4a^\alpha\partial\overline{\partial}f(W_\alpha \wedge W_{\overline{\beta}}) + \varphi^{-1}a^\alpha h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that a^α is $O(\varphi)$, whence has a continuous extension to the boundary by setting $a^\alpha|_M = 0$. The assertions for $\widetilde{\xi}, \widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha$ and $\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ follow immediately. $\square$

Defining the vector field $\eta = \eta^\alpha W_\alpha$ for $\eta^\alpha := \varphi^{-1}a^\alpha$, we may rewrite the equations for $\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha$ and $\widetilde{\xi}$ as

$$\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha = \vartheta^\alpha + \varphi\eta^\alpha\partial\varphi \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\xi} = \xi - \varphi\eta \tag{3.6}$$

in $\overline{U}$.

Lemma 3.3. *For the special defining function chosen according to Lemma 3.1, the transverse curvature function r vanishes on M.*

Proof. Using (3.4) and (3.3),

$$\frac{1}{\varphi^2} = 2\omega(\widetilde{\xi}\wedge\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}) = -\frac{2}{\varphi}\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi(\widetilde{\xi}\wedge\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}) + \frac{1}{\varphi^2} + 4\partial\overline{\partial}f(\widetilde{\xi}\wedge\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}).$$

Hence $\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi(\widetilde{\xi}\wedge\overline{\widetilde{\xi}})$ is $O(\varphi)$ from which it follows, by (3.6) and the definition of r, that r is $O(\varphi)$. □

3.2. **Levi-Civita connection and Ricci form.** We use the notation D for the Levi-Civita connection of (X, g_+). We shall compute the connection matrix $({\psi_j}^k)$ of D with respect to the coframe $\{\widetilde{\vartheta}^j\}$, where $\widetilde{\vartheta}^0 := \partial\varphi$. Denote by $g_{j\overline{k}}$ the components of g_+ with respect to this coframe, with

$$(g_{j\overline{k}}) = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^{-2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\varphi^{-1}\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$((g^{-1})^{j\overline{k}}) = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^{2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\varphi(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrix $({\psi_j}^k)$ is uniquely determined by the structure equations

$$d\widetilde{\vartheta}^j = \widetilde{\vartheta}^k \wedge {\psi_k}^j; \tag{3.7}$$

$$\psi_{j\overline{k}} + \psi_{\overline{k}j} = dg_{j\overline{k}}. \tag{3.8}$$

Substituting ${\psi_k}^j = {\psi_k}^j{}_l\widetilde{\vartheta}^l + {\psi_k}^j{}_{\overline{l}}\widetilde{\vartheta}^{\overline{l}}$ into (3.7) and using (2.2), (2.5) and (3.5) will uniquely determine all of the ${\psi_k}^j{}_{\overline{l}}$. The ${\psi_k}^j{}_l$ can then be uniquely determined from (3.8). The result of performing these computations is the following:

Proposition 3.4. *The Levi-Civita connection matrix of g_+ with respect to the coframe $\{\widetilde{\vartheta}^j\}$ is*

$$({\psi_j}^k) = \begin{pmatrix} {\psi_0}^0 & {\psi_\beta}^0 \\ {\psi_0}^\alpha & {\psi_\beta}^\alpha \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\psi_0}^0 \;&=\; \left(-2\varphi^{-1}+r+\varphi^2|\eta|^2\right)\partial\varphi \\
&\quad+\left(-\varphi\eta_\alpha\right)\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha \\
&\quad+\left(-r-\varphi^2|\eta|^2\right)\overline{\partial}\varphi \\
&\quad+\left(\varphi\eta_{\overline{\beta}}\right)\widetilde{\vartheta}^{\overline{\beta}}\,; \\
{\psi_\beta}^0 \;&=\; \left(-\varphi\eta_\beta\right)\partial\varphi \\
&\quad+\left(\varphi\widetilde{h}_{\beta\overline{\gamma}}\left(i{A^{\overline{\gamma}}}_\alpha-\varphi W_\alpha\eta^{\overline{\gamma}}-\varphi\eta^{\overline{\delta}}\overline{{\varphi_\delta}^{\gamma}{}_{\overline{\alpha}}}+\varphi^2\eta^{\overline{\gamma}}\eta_\alpha\right)\right)\widetilde{\vartheta}^\alpha \\
&\quad+\left(\varphi\eta_\beta\right)\overline{\partial}\varphi \\
&\quad+\left(-h_{\beta\overline{\gamma}}\right)\widetilde{\vartheta}^{\overline{\gamma}}\,; \\
{\psi_0}^\alpha \;&=\; \left((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\gamma}}\eta_{\overline{\gamma}}\right)\partial\varphi \\
&\quad+\left(-\varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\gamma}}h_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\right)\widetilde{\vartheta}^\delta \\
&\quad+\Big(-r^\alpha-\eta^\alpha-\varphi\overline{\xi}\eta^\alpha-\varphi\eta^\alpha r+\varphi\eta^{\overline{\beta}}(i{A^\alpha}_{\overline{\beta}}+\varphi W_{\overline{\beta}}\eta^\alpha) \\
&\qquad\quad-\varphi\eta^\beta({\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{0}}-\delta^\alpha_\beta\tfrac{1}{2}r-\varphi\eta^{\overline{\gamma}}{\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{\gamma}}+\varphi^2\eta^\alpha\eta_\beta)\Big)\overline{\partial}\varphi \\
&\quad+\left(-i{A^\alpha}_{\overline{\beta}}-\varphi W_{\overline{\beta}}\eta^\alpha-\varphi\eta^\gamma{\varphi_\gamma}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{\beta}}+\varphi^2\eta^\alpha\eta_{\overline{\beta}}\right)\widetilde{\vartheta}^{\overline{\beta}}\,; \\
{\psi_\beta}^\alpha \;&=\; \Big(\varphi(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\gamma}}\left(\xi(\varphi^{-1}\widetilde{h}_{\beta\overline{\gamma}})-\varphi^{-1}\widetilde{h}_{\beta\overline{\delta}}(\overline{{\varphi_\gamma}^{\delta}{}_{\overline{0}}}-\delta^{\overline{\delta}}_{\overline{\gamma}}\tfrac{1}{2}r)\right) \\
&\qquad-\varphi\eta^\gamma(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\delta}}\left(W_\gamma\widetilde{h}_{\beta\overline{\delta}}-\widetilde{h}_{\beta\overline{\mu}}(\overline{{\varphi_\delta}^{\mu}{}_{\overline{\gamma}}}-\varphi\eta^{\overline{\mu}}h_{\gamma\overline{\delta}})\right)\Big)\partial\varphi \\
&\quad+\left((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\gamma}}\left(W_\delta\widetilde{h}_{\beta\overline{\gamma}}-\widetilde{h}_{\beta\overline{\mu}}(\overline{{\varphi_\gamma}^{\mu}{}_{\overline{\delta}}}-\varphi\eta^{\overline{\mu}}h_{\delta\overline{\gamma}})\right)\right)\widetilde{\vartheta}^\delta \\
&\quad+\left({\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{0}}-\delta^\alpha_\beta\tfrac{1}{2}r-\varphi\eta^{\overline{\gamma}}{\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{\gamma}}+\varphi^2\eta^\alpha\eta_\beta\right)\overline{\partial}\varphi \\
&\quad+\left({\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{\gamma}}-\varphi\eta^\alpha h_{\beta\overline{\gamma}}\right)\widetilde{\vartheta}^{\overline{\gamma}}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we have written the ambient connection forms as

$$
{\varphi_\beta}^\alpha={\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{0}\partial\varphi+{\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{\delta}\vartheta^\delta+{\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{0}}\overline{\partial}\varphi+{\varphi_\beta}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{\gamma}}\vartheta^{\overline{\gamma}}.
$$

Proposition 3.5. *The Ricci form ρ of g_+ is $\rho = \rho_{j\overline{k}}\, \widetilde{\vartheta}^j \wedge \widetilde{\vartheta}^{\overline{k}}$ where*

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{0\overline{0}} &= -(n+2)\left(\frac{1}{\varphi^2} + Nr - \frac{1}{\varphi}r\right) \\
&\quad -(n+2)r^2 - r(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,0} - r^\alpha(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} - ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,0})_{,\,\overline{0}} \\
&\quad +\frac{1}{2}(\Delta_b r - 2|A|^2) \\
&\quad -\varphi^2\eta^\alpha\eta^{\overline{\beta}}\rho_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}; \\
\rho_{\alpha\overline{0}} &= -\varphi\rho_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\eta^{\overline{\beta}} - ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha})_{,\,\overline{0}} + iA_{\beta\alpha,}{}^{\beta} \\
&\quad -(n+2)r_\alpha - \frac{1}{2}r(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha}\,; \\
\rho_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} &= (n+2)\frac{1}{\varphi}h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} \\
&\quad -(n+2)rh_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} - ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,0})h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} - ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha})_{,\,\overline{\beta}} + \mathrm{Ric}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathrm{Ric}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ *denotes the ambient Ricci tensor.*

Proof. Recall that the Ricci form of a Kähler metric is defined to be $d\psi_j{}^j$. Using Proposition 3.4, rewriting in terms of covariant derivatives and using the commutation relations in Lemma 3.7 below gives the result. (One can also use Lemma 3.7 to check that Ricci form as given by Proposition 3.5 is in fact Hermitian symmetric.) □

3.3. **Einstein equation.** As mentioned in the Introduction, Fefferman [Fef76] solved the approximate Einstein equation

$$\rho = -(n+2)\omega + O(\varphi^{n+1}).$$

We shall use this equation to determine our desired power series expansion for g_+; in the following subsection we relate this expansion to Fefferman's solution. Now the $0\overline{0}$ component of this equation is

$$\begin{aligned}
&(n+2)\varphi Nr - (n+2)r \\
&+ \varphi\Big((n+2)r^2 + r(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,0} + r^\alpha(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} + ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,0})_{,\,\overline{0}} \\
&\qquad - \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_b r - 2|A|^2)\Big) \\
&+ \varphi^2(n+2)\eta^\alpha\eta^{\overline{\beta}}\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} = 0\,;
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

the $\alpha\overline{0}$ component is

(3.10)

$$(n+2)\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\eta^{\overline{\beta}} + ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha})_{,\,\overline{0}} - iA_{\beta\alpha,}{}^{\beta} + (n+2)r_\alpha + \frac{r}{2}(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} = 0\,;$$

and the $\alpha\overline{\beta}$ component is

(3.11)

$$\begin{aligned}
&(n+2)(\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} - h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}) \\
&+ \varphi\Big((n+2)rh_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} + ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,0})h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} + ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha})_{,\,\overline{\beta}} - \mathrm{Ric}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\Big) = 0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the formula for η^α from (3.10) into (3.9) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(n+2)\varphi N r - (n+2) r \\
&\quad + \varphi\Big((n+2)r^2 + r(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,0} + r^\alpha(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} + ((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,0})_{,\,\overline{0}} \\
&\qquad\qquad - \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_b r - 2|A|^2)\Big) \\
&\quad + \varphi^2 \frac{(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\beta}}}{n+2}\Big(((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\overline{\beta}})_{,\,0} + iA_{\overline{\gamma}\overline{\beta},}{}^{\overline{\gamma}} + (n+2)r_{\overline{\beta}} + \frac{1}{2}r(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\overline{\beta}}\Big) \\
&\quad \times \Big(((\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha})_{,\,\overline{0}} - iA_{\beta\alpha,}{}^{\beta} + (n+2)r_\alpha + \frac{1}{2}r(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha}\Big) = 0\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.12}
$$

and then our task is to use the system (3.11, 3.12) of $n(n+1)/2+1$ equations to obtain the Taylor series coefficients of the functions $\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$. As all the terms here transform tensorially, we can take ambient connection covariant derivatives as often as we please. To determine the components of the tensors $\nabla_N \widetilde{h}|_M, \nabla_N^2 \widetilde{h}|_M$, etc., we use the following:

Lemma 3.6. *Given a point $p \in \overline{U}$ there exists a frame $\{W_\alpha\}$ for $\mathcal{H}$ in a neighbourhood of p with respect to which ${\varphi_\alpha}^\beta{}_N := {\varphi_\alpha}^\beta(N) \equiv 0$ near p.*

Proof. Let $\{\widehat{W}_\alpha\}$ be any frame for $\mathcal{H}$ defined near $p \in M^\varepsilon$. Let $\{\widehat{\vartheta}^\alpha, \partial\varphi\}$ be the dual coframe to $\{\widehat{W}_\alpha, \xi\}$. Set $\vartheta^\alpha = a^\alpha_\beta \widehat{\vartheta}^\beta, W_\alpha = (a^{-1})^\beta_\alpha \widehat{W}_\beta$ for a matrix of functions (a^α_β) uniquely determined as follows. Substituting $a^\alpha_\beta\widehat{\vartheta}^\beta$ in place of ϑ^α in the structure equation (2.5) and examining only the $d\varphi \wedge \widehat{\vartheta}^\beta$ component yields

$$N a^\alpha_\beta - a^\alpha_\gamma {\widehat{\varphi}_\beta}{}^\gamma{}_N = -a^\delta_\beta {\varphi_\delta}^\alpha{}_N,$$

where ${\widehat{\varphi}_\alpha}{}^\beta$ and ${\varphi_\alpha}^\beta$ are the ambient connection forms with respect to $\{\widehat{W}_\alpha, \xi\}$ and $\{W_\alpha, \xi\}$ respectively. Set (a^α_β) to be the unique local solution to the initial-value problem

$$N a^\alpha_\beta - a^\alpha_\gamma {\widehat{\varphi}_\beta}{}^\gamma{}_N = 0\,; \quad (a^\alpha_\beta)|_{M^\varepsilon} = ((\overset{\circ}{a})^\alpha_\beta), \tag{3.13}$$

for an arbitrarily prescribed matrix $((\overset{\circ}{a})^\alpha_\beta)$. It is clear then that ${\varphi_\delta}^\alpha{}_N \equiv 0$ near p. □

Using a special frame produced by this lemma, ambient covariant differentiation in the direction N is simply the ordinary directional derivative N. So the components of the tensors $\nabla_N \widetilde{h}|_M, \nabla_N^2 \widetilde{h}|_M$, etc., with respect to this special frame are nothing more than $N\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}, N^2\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$, etc.. Moreover, $h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ becomes constant in the N direction.

Before dealing with the system (3.11, 3.12) we gather some useful identities. The proofs of the following three lemmas use the familiar result (see, e.g., [Lee88]) that there is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ in which the ambient connection forms vanish at a point.

Lemma 3.7. *The second covariant derivatives of a tensor of the form* $t = t_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}$ *satisfy the commutation relations*

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,NT} - t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,TN} &= i r^{\alpha} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} - i r^{\overline{\beta}} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\overline{\beta}} + r t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,T} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2}(r_{\delta}{}^{\mu} + r^{\mu}{}_{\delta} + 2A_{\delta\alpha}A^{\alpha\mu}) t_{\mu\overline{\gamma}} \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{2}(r_{\overline{\gamma}}{}^{\overline{\mu}} + r^{\overline{\mu}}{}_{\overline{\gamma}} + 2A_{\overline{\gamma}\overline{\beta}}A^{\overline{\beta}\overline{\mu}}) t_{\delta\overline{\mu}}; \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,N\alpha} - t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha N} &= \frac{1}{2} r t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} + \frac{i}{2} A^{\overline{\beta}}{}_{\alpha} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\overline{\beta}} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2} A^{\overline{\mu}}{}_{\alpha,\,\overline{\gamma}} t_{\delta\overline{\mu}} - \frac{i}{2} A_{\delta\alpha,}{}^{\mu} t_{\mu\overline{\gamma}} \\ &\quad - t_{\delta\overline{\mu}} r^{\overline{\mu}} h_{\alpha\overline{\gamma}} + t_{\alpha\overline{\gamma}} r_{\delta}; \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

$$t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,T\alpha} - t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha T} = A^{\overline{\beta}}{}_{\alpha} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\overline{\beta}} + A^{\overline{\mu}}{}_{\alpha,\,\overline{\gamma}} t_{\delta\overline{\mu}} - A_{\delta\alpha,}{}^{\mu} t_{\mu\overline{\gamma}}; \tag{3.16}$$

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha\mu} - t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\mu\alpha} &= i h_{\delta\overline{\beta}}(A^{\overline{\beta}}{}_{\mu} t_{\alpha\overline{\gamma}} - A^{\overline{\beta}}{}_{\alpha} t_{\mu\overline{\gamma}}) \\ &\quad - i t_{\delta\overline{\beta}}(A^{\overline{\beta}}{}_{\mu} h_{\alpha\overline{\gamma}} - A^{\overline{\beta}}{}_{\alpha} h_{\mu\overline{\gamma}}); \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

$$t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha\overline{\beta}} - t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\overline{\beta}\alpha} = i h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,T} + t_{\mu\overline{\gamma}} R_{\delta}{}^{\mu}{}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} - t_{\delta\overline{\mu}} R_{\overline{\gamma}}{}^{\overline{\mu}}{}_{\overline{\beta}\alpha}. \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. Take the exterior derivative d of the identity

$$dt_{\delta\overline{\gamma}} = t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,N} d\varphi + t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,T}\vartheta + t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha}\vartheta^{\alpha} + t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\overline{\beta}}\vartheta^{\overline{\beta}} + t_{\mu\overline{\gamma}}\varphi_{\delta}{}^{\mu} + t_{\delta\overline{\mu}}\varphi_{\overline{\gamma}}{}^{\overline{\mu}},$$

use (2.5) and (2.6), and compare like terms at a point where the ambient connection forms $\varphi_{\alpha}{}^{\beta}$ vanish. □

Lemma 3.8. *The third covariant derivatives of a tensor of the form* $t = t_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}$ *satisfy the commutation relations*

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha N\overline{\beta}} - t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha\overline{\beta}N} &= \frac{1}{2} r t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha\overline{\beta}} - \frac{i}{2} A^{\mu}{}_{\overline{\beta}} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha\mu} \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{2} A^{\mu}{}_{\overline{\beta},\,\delta} t_{\mu\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} + \frac{i}{2} A_{\overline{\gamma}\overline{\beta},}{}^{\overline{\mu}} t_{\delta\overline{\mu},\,\alpha} \\ &\quad - t_{\mu\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} r^{\mu} h_{\delta\overline{\beta}} + t_{\delta\overline{\beta},\,\alpha} r_{\overline{\gamma}} \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{2} A^{\mu}{}_{\overline{\beta},\,\alpha} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\mu} - t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\mu} r^{\mu} h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} - \frac{1}{2} t_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,\alpha} r_{\overline{\beta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. Similar to that of Lemma 3.7. □

Remark. If we take the tensor t to be $\widetilde{h}$, because $\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M = h_{\alpha\beta}|_M$, $\nabla h \equiv 0$ and $r|_M \equiv 0$, the right-hand sides of all the equations in Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 vanish on M.

Lemma 3.9. *The ambient Ricci and torsion tensors satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ric}_{\delta\overline{\gamma},\,N} &= \frac{i}{2}(A_{\alpha\delta,}{}^{\alpha}{}_{\overline{\gamma}} - A_{\overline{\beta}\overline{\gamma},}{}^{\overline{\beta}}{}_{\delta}) - (\frac{n}{2}+1)(r_{\delta\overline{\gamma}} + r_{\overline{\gamma}\delta}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_b r - 2|A|^2)h_{\delta\overline{\gamma}} - r\mathrm{Ric}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}; \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

$$A_{\alpha\beta,\,N} = -rA_{\alpha\beta} + ir_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{i}{2}A_{\alpha\beta,\,T}. \tag{3.21}$$

Proof. Work in a frame where the ambient connection forms vanish at a point. Then the first identity follows by taking the exterior derivative d of the curvature equation (2.6) and the second identity is obtained by taking d of the structure equation (2.5). $\square$

Now applying ∇_N to (3.11), evaluating on M and using a prime to denote covariant differentiation in the direction N gives

$$(n+2)\widetilde{h}'_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} + h^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}'_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} - \mathrm{Ric}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} = 0.$$

Taking trace,

$$h^{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\widetilde{h}'_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\Big|_M = \frac{1}{2(n+1)}\mathrm{Scal},$$

where Scal is the pseudohermitian scalar curvature. Substituting this into the previous equation yields

$$\widetilde{h}'_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M = \frac{1}{n+2}\left(\mathrm{Ric}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} - \frac{1}{2(n+1)}\mathrm{Scal}h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\right). \tag{3.22}$$

Remark that this is the so-called *conformal Ricci tensor*; an analogous tensor appears in the conformal setting also ([Gra00]).

In order to determine $\widetilde{h}''_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M$ we first calculate $h^{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\widetilde{h}''_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M$ in terms of $r'|_M$ and pseudohermitian invariants of (M,θ) by applying ∇_N to (3.12) and evaluating on M. Applying ∇_N^2 to (3.11), taking trace and inserting the just-computed value for $h^{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\widetilde{h}''_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M$ determines $r'|_M$ and hence $\widetilde{h}''_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M$.

In general, applying ∇_N^k to (3.11), taking trace and evaluating on M yields

$$h^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}^{(k)}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}|_M = \frac{-kn(n+2)r^{(k-1)}|_M}{kn+n+2} + (\text{terms involving } \widetilde{h}^{(l)}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}},\ r^{(l-1)},\ l<k\ ). \tag{3.23}$$

On the other hand applying ∇_N^{k-1} to (3.12) and evaluating on M gives

$$(k-2)r^{(k-1)}|_M = -\frac{k-1}{n+2}h^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}^{(k)}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}|_M + (\text{terms involving } \widetilde{h}^{(l)}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}},\ r^{(l-1)},\ l<k\ ). \tag{3.24}$$

Substituting (3.24) into (3.23) gives

$$\{k-(n+2)\}h^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}^{(k)}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}|_M = (\text{terms involving } \widetilde{h}^{(l)}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}},\ l<k\ ). \tag{3.25}$$

Thus an obstruction to determining the trace of $\widetilde{h}^{(k)}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M$ occurs when the contents of the braces in (3.25) is zero, i.e, when $k = n+2$. Our inductive procedure will hence determine the trace of the Taylor coefficients of $\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ up to the coefficient of φ^{n+1}. On the other hand, applying ∇_N^k to (3.11) and evaluating on M yields

$$\widetilde{h}^{(k)}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}|_M = -k\left(r^{(k-1)} + \frac{1}{n+2}h^{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\widetilde{h}^{(k)}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}}\right) h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\Big|_M + (\text{terms involving } \widetilde{h}^{(l)}_{\delta\overline{\gamma}},\ l < k\ ).$$

Using (3.24) this shows that we can determine the trace-free part of the Taylor coefficients of $\widetilde{h}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}$ up to the coefficient of φ^{n+2}.

3.4. **Relation to Fefferman's approach.** Of course the fact that the obstruction is a scalar function merely verifies Fefferman's result in [Fef76]. In that paper it was shown that there is a smooth local solution ρ to the Monge–Ampére problem

$$\begin{cases} J(\rho) := \det\begin{pmatrix} \rho & \rho_{\overline{k}} \\ \rho_j & \rho_{j\overline{k}} \end{pmatrix} = -1 + O(\rho^{n+2}),\ \ \rho_j := \partial_j\rho,\ \text{etc.}; \\ \rho = 0 \text{ on } M,\ \rho < 0 \text{ on } X \end{cases} \tag{3.26}$$

that is unique modulo the addition of terms of order $O(\varphi^{n+3})$. For such a solution, Fefferman's approximately Einstein metric is given by the Kähler form

$$\omega = -\partial\overline{\partial}\log(-\rho(1 + O(\varphi^{n+2}))),$$

where the $O(\varphi^{n+2})$ term is formally undetermined. Contracting with $W_\alpha \wedge W_{\overline{\beta}}$ and using (2.2),

$$\omega(W_\alpha \wedge W_{\overline{\beta}}) = -\partial\overline{\partial}\log(-\rho)(W_\alpha \wedge W_{\overline{\beta}}) + \varphi^{n+1} v h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} + \text{higher order terms in } \varphi,$$

for a function v on M that is formally undetermined. In other words, an ambiguity arises in the trace part of $\omega|_{\mathcal{H}}$ at order $n+1$, just as via our calculations.

4. VOLUME RENORMALISATION

The Hermitian volume element dv_+ of g_+ on X near M is by definition

$$dv_+ = \left(\frac{i}{2}\right)^{n+1} \frac{1}{(n+1)!}\omega^{n+1}. \tag{4.1}$$

Using (3.4), (3.5) and (2.3) this is

$$dv_+ = \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{n+1}}\frac{\det\widetilde{h}}{n!\det h}\varphi^{-n-2}\, d\varphi \wedge \vartheta \wedge (d\vartheta)^n. \tag{4.2}$$

We want to pull this form back to the product manifold $M \times (\delta, 0]$ via our diffeomorphism F (recall §3.1). A basis for $T^*(M \times (\delta, 0])$ is $\{d\varphi, \theta, \theta^\alpha, \theta^{\overline{\alpha}}\}$, where $\theta, \theta^\alpha, \theta^{\overline{\alpha}}$ are defined by pulling back $\vartheta, \vartheta^\alpha, \vartheta^{\overline{\alpha}}$ to M under the inclusion $M \hookrightarrow \overline{U}$ and then extending constantly in the N-direction. For some uniquely determined function s on $M \times (\delta, 0]$ we have

$$F^*(\vartheta \wedge (d\vartheta)^n) \equiv s\,\theta \wedge (d\theta)^n \mod d\varphi.$$

Contracting with the vector field $\partial/\partial\varphi$, using (2.3) and that $F_*(\partial/\partial\varphi) = N$ and $\vartheta(N) = 0$ shows that in fact this is a strict equality:

$$F^*(\vartheta \wedge (d\vartheta)^n) = s\,\theta \wedge (d\theta)^n.$$

To determine s, take the exterior derivative d of this equation and use (2.3) to give s as the solution to the boundary-value problem

$$Ns = (n+1)rs\,; \qquad s|_M \equiv 1. \tag{4.3}$$

Since $\widetilde{h}$ is only known up to order $O(\varphi^{n+1})$ we look for a formal solution to (4.3) up to order $O(\varphi^{n+1})$. From (4.2)

$$F^*(dv_+) = \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{n+1}} \frac{\det \widetilde{h}}{n! \det h} s\varphi^{-n-2}\, d\varphi \wedge \theta \wedge (d\theta)^n. \tag{4.4}$$

For some locally determined functions $v^{(j)}$ on M this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} F^*(dv_+) \;&=\; \varphi^{-n-2}(v^{(0)} + v^{(1)}\varphi + v^{(2)}\varphi^2 + \cdots + v^{(n+1)}\varphi^{n+1} + \\ &\qquad \text{higher order terms in } \varphi)\, d\varphi \wedge \theta \wedge (d\theta)^n. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

From here the procedure is identical to that in the conformal setting ([Gra00]). Pick a small number $\varepsilon_0 \in (\delta, 0)$, let $\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon < 0$ and set U^ε to be the image under F of $M \times (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon)$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Vol}_+(\{\varphi < \varepsilon\}) \;&=\; \text{const.} + \int_{U^\varepsilon} dv_+ \\ &=\; \text{const.} + \int_{\varepsilon_0}^{\varepsilon} \int_M F^*(dv_+). \end{aligned}$$

Here "const." is the volume of the compact set $\{\varphi < \varepsilon_0\}$ with respect to any Hermitian metric whose asymptotic expansion near M agrees with the expansion of g_+. It follows that

$$\mathrm{Vol}_+(\{\varphi < \varepsilon\}) = c_0\varepsilon^{-n-1} + c_1\varepsilon^{-n} + \cdots + c_n\varepsilon^{-1} + L\log(-\varepsilon) + V + o(1). \tag{4.6}$$

The constant term V is called the *renormalised volume* in accordance with [HS98] and [Gra00]. The coefficients c_j and L are integrals over M of local pseudohermitian invariants of M, with respect to the volume element $\theta \wedge (d\theta)^n$. In particular,

$$L = \int_M v^{(n+1)} \theta \wedge (d\theta)^n.$$

The following result is an analogue of Theorem 3.1 of [Gra00] (and is proved in the same way).

Proposition 4.1. *The number L is independent of the choice of pseudohermitian structure on M.*

Proof. Let θ and $\widehat{\theta} = e^{2\Upsilon}\theta$ be two pseudohermitian structures on M, for Υ a function on M, with associated (by Lemma 3.1) special defining functions φ and $\widehat{\varphi}$. So $\widehat{\varphi} = e^{2f(x,\varphi)}\varphi$, for a function f in a neighbourhood of M, where we have used x as a coordinate on M. We can inductively solve the equation $\widehat{\varphi} = e^{2f(x,\varphi)}\varphi$ for φ to give $\varphi = \widehat{\varphi} b(x, \widehat{\varphi})$, for a uniquely determined positive function b. In this relation the x still refers to the identification of $\overline{U}$ and $M \times [0, \delta)$ constructed using φ. Set $\widehat{\varepsilon}(x, \varepsilon) := \varepsilon b(x, \varepsilon)$. It follows that $\widehat{\varphi} < \varepsilon$

is equivalent to $\varphi < \widehat{\varepsilon}(x, \varepsilon)$, hence using (4.5) we have

(4.7)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Vol}_+(\{\widehat{\varphi} < \varepsilon\}) - \mathrm{Vol}_+(\{\varphi < \varepsilon\}) &= \int_M \int_\varepsilon^{\widehat{\varepsilon}} F^*(dv_+) \\ = \int_M \int_\varepsilon^{\widehat{\varepsilon}} \varphi^{-n-2}(v^{(0)} + v^{(1)}\varphi + \cdots + v^{(n+1)}\varphi^{n+1})\, d\varphi \wedge \theta \wedge (d\theta)^n &\ + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

In this expression the φ^{-1} term contributes $\log b(x, \varepsilon)$, so there is no $\log(-\varepsilon)$ term as $\varepsilon \to 0$. $\square$

While L is independent of the choice of pseudohermitian structure, the renormalised volume is not. If V_θ and $V_{\widehat{\theta}}$ are the renormalised volumes corresponding to pseudohermitian structures θ and $\widehat{\theta} = e^{2\Upsilon}\theta$, then in accordance with [HS98] and [Gra00] we define the *conformal anomaly* to be $V_{\widehat{\theta}} - V_\theta$. So the conformal anomaly is simply the constant term in the expansion (4.7). From the form of the function b used in the proof of Proposition 4.1, it follows that

$$V_{\widehat{\theta}} - V_\theta = \int_M \mathcal{P}_\theta(\Upsilon)\ \theta \wedge (d\theta)^n,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\theta$ is a polynomial nonlinear differential operator whose coefficients are pseudohermitian invariants of (M, θ). It is important to note that the first variation of the conformal anomaly is *not* simply $\int_M 2v^{(n+1)}\Upsilon\ \theta \wedge (d\theta)^n$, as one may initially suspect by analogy with the conformal setting of [Gra00]. The next section shows some of the extra computations and terms that arise.

5. RENORMALISED VOLUME WHEN $n = 1$ (PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1)

To simplify the computation a little we may assume that $h^{1\bar{1}} \equiv 1$; this is achieved through an appropriate choice of initial condition in the proof (equation (3.13)) of Lemma 3.6. We may now write $\widetilde{h}$ instead of $\widetilde{h}_{1\bar{1}}$ and Scal instead of $\mathrm{Ric}_{1\bar{1}}$. Now applying N^2 to (3.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned}3\widetilde{h}'' + 2\Big(3r' + (\widetilde{h}^{-1})'(\widetilde{h}' - \frac{i}{2}\widetilde{h}_{,T}) + (\widetilde{h}^{-1})(\widetilde{h}'' - \frac{i}{2}\widetilde{h}_{,TN}) + (\widetilde{h}^{-1})_{,\bar{1}N}\widetilde{h}_{,1} \\ + (\widetilde{h}^{-1})_{,\bar{1}}\widetilde{h}_{,1N} + (\widetilde{h}^{-1})\widetilde{h}_{,1\bar{1}N} + (\widetilde{h}^{-1})'\widetilde{h}_{,1\bar{1}} - \mathrm{Scal}'\Big) = O(\varphi).\end{aligned}$$

Evaluating on M and using the remark following Lemma 3.8 gives

$$3\widetilde{h}'' + 6r' + 2(\widetilde{h}^{-1})'\widetilde{h}' + 2\widetilde{h}'' - i\widetilde{h}'_{,T} + 2\widetilde{h}'_{,1\bar{1}} - 2\,\mathrm{Scal}' = 0.$$

Using (3.18) this becomes

$$2r' = -\frac{5}{3}\widetilde{h}'' + \frac{2}{3}(\widetilde{h}')^2 + \frac{1}{3}\Delta_b\widetilde{h}' + \frac{2}{3}\mathrm{Scal}',$$

which after substituting (3.22) is

$$2r' = -\frac{5}{3}\widetilde{h}'' + \frac{1}{24}(\mathrm{Scal})^2 + \frac{1}{12}\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} + \frac{2}{3}\mathrm{Scal}'.$$

Finally using (3.20) yields

$$2r' = -\frac{5}{3}\widetilde{h}'' + \frac{1}{24}(\mathrm{Scal})^2 - \frac{2}{3}|A|^2 + \frac{1}{12}\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} - \frac{2}{3}\mathrm{Im}A_{11,}{}^{11} \quad \text{on } M. \tag{5.1}$$

Turning now to equation (3.12), a short computation, similar to the one just done, gives

$$\widetilde{h}'' = \frac{1}{16}(\mathrm{Scal})^2 - |A|^2 \quad \text{on } M. \tag{5.2}$$

Therefore up to terms of order $O(\varphi^2)$ we have that

$$\widetilde{h} = 1 + \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{Scal}\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{16}(\mathrm{Scal})^2 - |A|^2\right)\varphi^2, \tag{5.3}$$

where Scal and A_{11} are evaluated on M.

When $n = 1$, it is easily seen that the solution up to the second jet of the boundary-value problem (4.3) is

$$s = 1 + (r'|_M)\varphi^2 + O(\varphi^3).$$

Then from (4.4) and (4.5) the volume form on the product manifold $M \times (\delta, 0]$ is

$$-\frac{1}{4}\varphi^{-3}\Big(1+(\widetilde{h}'|_M)\varphi+\frac{1}{2}(\widetilde{h}''|_M)\varphi^2+\cdots\Big)\Big(1+(r'|_M)\varphi^2+\cdots\Big)\, d\varphi\wedge\theta\wedge d\theta. \tag{5.4}$$

The coefficient of φ^{-1} in this expansion is

$$\begin{aligned} v^{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{8}(2r' + \widetilde{h}'')|_M \\ &= -\frac{1}{8}\left(\frac{1}{12}\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} - \frac{2}{3}\mathrm{Im}A_{11,}{}^{11}\right)\Big|_M, \end{aligned}$$

using (5.1) and (5.2). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} L &= -\frac{1}{8}\int_M \frac{1}{12}\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} - \frac{2}{3}\mathrm{Im}A_{11,}{}^{11}\ \theta\wedge d\theta \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

by the divergence formula (2.7).

We now proceed to calculate the conformal anomaly, using the notation in the proof of Proposition 4.1. By (4.7) the conformal anomaly is the constant term in ε in

$$\int_M\int_\varepsilon^{\widehat{\varepsilon}} \varphi^{-3}(v^{(0)} + v^{(1)}\varphi + v^{(2)}\varphi^2)\, d\varphi\wedge\theta\wedge d\theta.$$

Performing the integration with respect to φ this constant term eventually simplifies to

$$\int_M -v^{(0)}f''|_M - 2v^{(1)}f'|_M - 2v^{(2)}\Upsilon\ \theta\wedge d\theta,$$

where we recall that $\widehat{\varphi} = e^{2f}\varphi$ is the special defining function associated to $\widehat{\theta}$. Using (4.5) and (5.4) we calculate the coefficients $v^{(j)}$ to get the conformal anomaly as

$$V_{\widehat{\theta}} - V_\theta = \int_M \frac{1}{4}f''|_M + \frac{1}{8}\mathrm{Scal}f'|_M + \frac{1}{48}(\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} - 8\mathrm{Im}A_{11,}{}^{11})\Upsilon\,\theta\wedge d\theta. \tag{5.5}$$

Now from the proof of Lemma 3.1, the function f is the unique solution to the boundary-value problem given by the PDE

$$\frac{4}{\varphi}\mathrm{Re}\langle\partial\varphi, \partial f\rangle_{g_+} + 4|\partial f|^2_{g_+} = 0$$

and the boundary condition $f|_M = \Upsilon$. The PDE becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 2f' - \varphi(f_1\eta^1 + f_{\overline{1}}\eta^{\overline{1}}) - 2(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{1\overline{1}} f_1 f_{\overline{1}} + 2\varphi^3\eta^1\eta^{\overline{1}} f_1 f_{\overline{1}} + 2\varphi f_0 f_{\overline{0}} \\ - 2\varphi^2\eta^1 f_1 f_{\overline{0}} - 2\varphi^2\eta^{\overline{1}} f_{\overline{1}} f_0 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Thus $f'|_M = \Upsilon_1\Upsilon^1$.

To compute $f''|_M$ we, as usual, apply ∇_N to (5.6) while working in a special frame given by Lemma 3.6 and then evaluate on M. We also need to commute covariant derivatives of the function f, for which we use the formula, derived similarly to those in Lemma 3.7,

$$f_{1N} = f_{N1} - \frac{1}{2} f_1 r - \frac{i}{2} f_{\overline{1}} A^{\overline{1}}{}_1.$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f''|_M = & \frac{1}{2}(\Upsilon_1\eta^1 + \Upsilon_{\overline{1}}\eta^{\overline{1}}) - (\Upsilon_1\Upsilon^1)^2 - \frac{1}{4}(\Upsilon_T)^2 - \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{Scal}\Upsilon_1\Upsilon^1 \\ & + 2\mathrm{Re}(\Upsilon_{11}\Upsilon^1\Upsilon^1) - \Upsilon_1\Upsilon^1\Delta_b\Upsilon - \mathrm{Im}(\Upsilon_1\Upsilon_1 A^{11}). \end{aligned}$$

From (3.10),

$$\eta^1 = \frac{1}{3}\left(-\frac{1}{4}\mathrm{Scal}^1 - iA^1{}_{\overline{1},}{}^{\overline{1}}\right).$$

Substituting the previous two formulae into (5.5) and integrating by parts gives the formula for the conformal anomaly in Theorem 1.1, thereby completing the proof.

6. A renormalised Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula when $n = 1$ (proof of Corollary 1.2)

Recall from the statement of Corollary 1.2 that we now suppose we are given a complete Einstein–Kähler metric g_{EK} on X. Let X^ε denote the region enclosed by the hypersurface M^ε. The Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula ([Che45]) for a complex manifold-with-boundary tells us that

$$\chi(X^\varepsilon) = \int_{X^\varepsilon} c_2 + \int_{M^\varepsilon} \Pi^\varepsilon, \tag{6.1}$$

where c_2 is the second Chern form and Π^ε is the restriction to M^ε of a certain top-form Π on X. The original formula for Π consists of wedge products of Levi-Civita curvature and connection components in an orthonormal basis. It is straightforward to derive from this an expression in basis-free notation. Indeed, let ν be the unit outward normal to M^ε and R denote the curvature of X, viewed as a two-vector-valued two-form. If $\Sigma = Z \otimes \zeta$ is a k-vector-valued k-form and $\Sigma' = Z' \otimes \zeta'$ is an k'-vector-valued k'-form then $\Sigma \wedge \Sigma'$ will denote the $(k+k')$-vector-valued $(k+k')$-form $Z \wedge Z' \otimes \zeta \wedge \zeta'$. Then it holds that

$$\Pi^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{12\pi^2} dv^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{EK}} \lrcorner\, (D\nu \wedge D\nu \wedge D\nu + 3D\nu \wedge R), \tag{6.2}$$

where for Σ a three-vector-valued three-form on M^ε, $dv^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{EK}} \lrcorner\, (\Sigma)$ denotes the three-form given by contraction of Σ with the volume form on M^ε induced from that on (X, g_{EK}). (In the above, we are assuming skew-symmetry as vectors as well as forms.)

Now as $\varepsilon \to 0$, the integral over X^ε in (6.1) will diverge; however Burns–Epstein [BE90] proved that replacing c_2 by the renormalised Chern form $\widetilde{c_2} := c_2 - (1/3){c_1}^2$ results in a convergent integral. Thus we may rewrite (6.1) as

$$\chi(X^\varepsilon) = \int_{X^\varepsilon}\left(c_2 - \frac{1}{3}{c_1}^2\right) + \frac{1}{3}\int_{X^\varepsilon}{c_1}^2 + \int_{M^\varepsilon}\Pi^\varepsilon, \tag{6.3}$$

where the first integral is now convergent. If we expand the second and third integrals as power series in ε, it follows that as $\varepsilon \to 0$ only the constant term in these series will remain. By the Einstein condition,

$${c_1}^2 = \left(-(n+2)\frac{i}{2\pi}\omega_{\mathrm{EK}}\right)^2 = \frac{18}{\pi^2}dv_{\mathrm{EK}},$$

where ω_{EK} (dv_{EK}) is the Kähler (volume) form of g_{EK}. Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ in (6.3) we obtain

$$\chi(X) = \int_X\left(c_2 - \frac{1}{3}{c_1}^2\right) + \frac{6}{\pi^2}V_\theta + \int_M S_\theta\,\theta\wedge d\theta, \tag{6.4}$$

where V_θ is the renormalised volume with respect to the pseudohermitian structure θ and $S_\theta\,\theta\wedge d\theta$ is defined to be the pullback to M of the constant term in the power series expansion of Π^ε.

In order to compute S_θ one could use the explicit expression for Π^ε and consider its asymptotics as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This computationally tedious approach though can be avoided by using some elementary invariant theory and the formula obtained earlier for the conformal anomaly. We first observe how S_θ changes under a particular change of pseudohermitian structure.

Lemma 6.1. *If $\widehat{\theta} = e^{2c}\theta$, for a constant c, then $S_{\widehat{\theta}} = e^{-4c}S_\theta$.*

Proof. From Lemma 3.1, the special defining functions φ and $\widehat{\varphi}$ associated to the pseudohermitian structures θ and $\widehat{\theta}$, respectively, satisfy the relation $\widehat{\varphi} = e^{2c}\varphi$. Hence φ and $\widehat{\varphi}$ have the same level sets, implying

$$S_\theta\,\theta\wedge d\theta = S_{\widehat{\theta}}\,\widehat{\theta}\wedge d\widehat{\theta}$$

and completing the proof. □

We can now see the form that S_θ must take:

Lemma 6.2. *There exist universal constants a, b such that*

$$S_\theta = a(\mathrm{Scal})^2 + b|A|^2 + \text{ divergence}.$$

Here "divergence" denotes a function whose integral over M will vanish via the divergence formula (2.7).

Proof. By (6.2) it is clear that S_θ must be a polynomial expression in the components of the pseudohermitian curvature and torsion and their pseudohermitian covariant derivatives. It also must hold that S_θ be invariant under a change of frame for the holomorphic tangent bundle. In other words, in the terminology of [Hir92], S_θ is a scalar pseudohermitian invariant. But the scalar pseudohermitian invariants that satisfy the same transformation law as S_θ does in Lemma 6.1 are shown in the proof of Theorem 5.1 of [Hir92] to be

$$\mathrm{Scal}_1{}^1,\ \mathrm{Scal}_{\overline{1}}{}^{\overline{1}},\ A_{11,}{}^{11},\ A_{\overline{11},}{}^{\overline{11}},\ (\mathrm{Scal})^2,\ |A|^2,$$

and the result follows. $\square$

To find the constants in Lemma 6.2, we compute the first variation of the conformal anomaly using (6.4) and compare it with the value given by Theorem 1.1. It suffices to do this for a special kind of pseudohermitian manifold, since the constants in question are universal. We will need the following basic result; for a proof see, e.g., [Lee86].

Lemma 6.3. *If $\widehat{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\widehat{\mathrm{Scal}}$ denote the pseudohermitian torsion and scalar curvature of M with respect to the pseudohermitian structure $\widehat{\theta} = e^{2\Upsilon}\theta$, for a function Υ, then*

$$\widehat{A}_{\alpha\beta} = e^{-2\Upsilon}(A_{\alpha\beta} + 2i\Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} - 4i\Upsilon_\alpha\Upsilon_\beta),$$
$$\widehat{\mathrm{Scal}} = e^{-2\Upsilon}(\mathrm{Scal} + 4\Delta_b\Upsilon - 8\Upsilon_\alpha\Upsilon^\alpha).$$

Now in general, from (6.4), the quantity

$$\mathcal{V}(M) := \frac{6}{\pi^2}V_\theta + \int_M S_\theta\,\theta\wedge d\theta$$

is a global CR invariant. Let $\widehat{\mathrm{Scal}}_t, \widehat{A}_t$ and $V_{\widehat{\theta}_t}$ denote the scalar curvature, torsion and renormalised volume with respect to the pseudohermitian structure $\widehat{\theta}_t := e^{2\Upsilon t}\theta$, for a real parameter t. Then

(6.5)
$$\begin{aligned} V_{\widehat{\theta}_t} - V_\theta &= \frac{\pi^2}{6}\left(\int_M S_\theta\,\theta\wedge d\theta - \int_M S_{\widehat{\theta}_t}\,\widehat{\theta}_t\wedge d\widehat{\theta}_t\right) \\ &= \frac{\pi^2}{6}\int_M a\Big((\mathrm{Scal})^2 - (e^{2t\Upsilon}\widehat{\mathrm{Scal}_t})^2\Big) + b\Big(|A|^2 - |e^{2t\Upsilon}\widehat{A}_t|^2\Big)\ \theta\wedge d\theta \\ &= -\frac{\pi^2}{3}\int_M t(4a\Upsilon\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} + 2b\Upsilon\mathrm{Im}A_{11,}{}^{11})\ \theta\wedge d\theta + \int_M O(t^2); \end{aligned}$$

the last equality here is obtained from Lemma 6.3 and integrating by parts. The first variation of the conformal anomaly is

$$\frac{d}{dt}V_{\widehat{\theta}_t}|_{t=0} = -\frac{\pi^2}{3}\int_M 4a\Upsilon\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} + 2b\Upsilon\mathrm{Im}A_{11,}{}^{11}\ \theta\wedge d\theta.$$

It is a fact that there exists a CR three-manifold, embeddable in a complex two-manifold, with a pseudohermitian structure whose torsion is identically zero but whose scalar curvature is not everywhere-annihilated by the sublaplacian. Let now (M,θ) be this manifold. Set $\Upsilon = \Delta_b\mathrm{Scal}$. Then

$$\frac{d}{dt}V_{\widehat{\theta}_t}|_{t=0} = -\frac{4a\pi^2}{3}\int_M (\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal})^2\ \theta\wedge d\theta.$$

But in a similar way, Theorem 1.1 tells us that

$$\frac{d}{dt}V_{\widehat{\theta}_t}|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{96}\int_M (\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal})^2\ \theta\wedge d\theta.$$

We conclude that

$$a = -\frac{1}{128\pi^2}.$$

Returning to the general case, this time we set $\Upsilon = \mathrm{Im} {A_{11,}}^{11}$—it is a fact that there exist pseudohermitian manifolds on which this function is not identically zero—and proceed as above to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}V_{\widehat{\theta}_t}|_{t=0} = \int_M \frac{1}{96}\mathrm{Im}{A_{11,}}^{11}\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} - \frac{2b\pi^2}{3}(\mathrm{Im}{A_{11,}}^{11})^2\ \theta\wedge d\theta.$$

But this time Theorem 1.1 tells us that

$$\frac{d}{dt}V_{\widehat{\theta}_t}|_{t=0} = \int_M \frac{1}{96}\mathrm{Im}{A_{11,}}^{11}\Delta_b\mathrm{Scal} - \frac{1}{12}(\mathrm{Im}{A_{11,}}^{11})^2\ \theta\wedge d\theta.$$

We conclude that

$$b = \frac{1}{8\pi^2},$$

and Corollary 1.2 is proved.

Remark. A similar Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula will hold if X is any complex manifold with Hermitian metric g whose asymptotic expansion near M agrees with that of Fefferman's approximately Einstein metric g_+. For simplicity, if we choose the Hermitian metric used in the definition of renormalised volume (§ 4) to be g, then for a small negative number ε_0, if $\mathrm{Vol}_g(\{\varphi<\varepsilon_0\})$ denotes the volume of the set $\{\varphi<\varepsilon_0\}$ with respect to g, we have

$$\chi(X) = \int_X\left(c_2 - \frac{1}{3}{c_1}^2\right) + \mathcal{V}(M) - \frac{6}{\pi^2}\mathrm{Vol}_g(\{\varphi<\varepsilon_0\}) + \frac{1}{3}\int_{\{\varphi<\varepsilon_0\}} c_1^2\,.$$

7. Example: The Bergman metric on the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^2$

Let $\overline{B}$ denote the closed unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^2 \ni (z,w)$. Its interior B carries a unique globally defined Einstein–Kähler metric, the Bergman metric, with Kähler form

$$\omega_{\mathrm{B}} = \partial\overline{\partial}\log\left(-\frac{1}{\rho}\right), \tag{7.1}$$

where

$$\rho(z,w) = R^2 - 1$$

and

$$R := \sqrt{z\overline{z} + w\overline{w}}.$$

The unit sphere S forming the boundary of $\overline{B}$ inherits a natural CR structure from $\mathbb{C}^2$. The so-called standard pseudohermitian structure on S is

$$\theta = \frac{i}{2}(\overline{\partial}\rho - \partial\rho)|_S = -i\partial\rho|_S = -i(\overline{z}dz + \overline{w}dw)|_S.$$

For this θ,

$$\mathrm{Scal} \equiv 2; \quad A \equiv 0$$

([Web78]). It is also easy to check that

$$\theta\wedge d\theta = 2dv_{\mathrm{S}},$$

where dv_{S} denotes the usual volume form on S given by restriction of the Euclidean volume form on $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Our goals in this section are to compute the renormalised volume V of B with respect to ω and θ and to verify the renormalised Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula in Corollary 1.2.

The first step is to find the special defining function φ associated to θ. In fact one may verify that

$$\varphi = 4\left(\frac{R-1}{R+1}\right) \tag{7.2}$$

solves the boundary-value problem in Lemma 3.1 for θ as above. (Suspecting a defining function of this form was motivated by a similar defining function appearing in the conformal setting for the Poincaré metric on the ball ([Gra00])).

Now in general the asymptotic procedures of the preceeding sections do not allow one to compute the renormalised volume. However in our particular example we will be able to compute V directly by ad hoc methods. Indeed, a straightforward calculation gives the volume form for the Bergman metric as

$$dv_{\mathrm{B}} = \frac{1}{(1-R^2)^3} dv_{\mathrm{Eu}},$$

where dv_{Eu} denotes the Euclidean volume form. In polar coordinates

$$dv_{\mathrm{B}} = \frac{R^3}{(1-R^2)^3} dR \wedge dv_{\mathrm{S}}.$$

Finally in terms of the special coordinate φ we obtain

$$dv_{\mathrm{B}} = \varphi^{-3}\left(-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}\varphi + \frac{1}{64}\varphi^3 + \frac{1}{512}\varphi^4\right) d\varphi \wedge dv_{\mathrm{S}}. \tag{7.3}$$

Thus

$$\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathrm{B}}(\{\varphi < \varepsilon\}) = \int_S dv_{\mathrm{S}} \int_{-4}^{\varepsilon} \varphi^{-3}\left(-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}\varphi + \frac{1}{64}\varphi^3 + \frac{1}{512}\varphi^4\right) d\varphi.$$

Integrating and looking at the constant term in ε we get

$$V = \frac{3\pi^2}{16}.$$

Observe also that there is no log term in ε, as we should expect.

We now present a second derivation of the formula (7.3) that is longer but will illustrate concretely most of the rather technical frame change calculations and the like of the preceeding sections. Recall from the formula (4.4) for the volume form and the subsequent discussion that the ingredients we need are *exact* formulae (i.e., not just asymptotic approximations—we are interested in the constant term V) for the following: the tensor $\widetilde{h}$ appearing in the diagonal expression (3.4) for the Kähler form; the tensor h appearing in (2.2); and the function s that solves (4.3). We shall moreover work with a special frame given by Lemma 3.6 that in addition satisfies $h_{1\bar{1}}|_S \equiv 1$. By working with such a frame we may ignore the h term appearing in (4.4) and also more readily verify the formulae given for $\widetilde{h}$ and the transverse curvature r in § 5. In other words we shall, for our particular example, carry out all of the computations in the volume renormalisation procedure, with the exception of solving the Einstein equation for $\widetilde{h}$. The formula for $\widetilde{h}$ will instead be directly apparent.

Let us begin with the appropriate choice of frame. The natural CR structure on S is usually defined by the restriction to S of

$$\vartheta^1 = -w dz + z dw.$$

For this coframe in fact $h_{1\overline{1}}|_S \equiv 1$. The dual frame is

$$W_1 = \frac{1}{R^2}\left(-\overline{w}\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \overline{z}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\right).$$

Then with special φ defined as in (7.2), we compute the vector field ξ from its characterisation (2.1):

$$\xi = \frac{(R+1)^2}{4R}\left(z\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + w\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\right).$$

Now if we take $\widetilde{\vartheta}^1 = \vartheta^1$ then it is readily observed that

$$\widetilde{h}_{1\overline{1}} = \frac{4}{R^2(R+1)^2}$$

satisfies (3.4). However we want to work with a special frame given by Lemma 3.6; thus we need to multiply $\widetilde{\vartheta}^1$ by the function a that solves (3.13). The connection form ${\varphi_1}^1$ may be determined from the structure equation (2.5). We obtain

$${\varphi_1}^1{}_N = \frac{-5R^2 - 8R - 3}{16R}$$

and then

$$a = \frac{2}{R^{3/2}(R+1)}.$$

Therefore in this special frame

$$\widetilde{h} = \frac{\left(\dfrac{4}{R^2(R+1)^2}\right)}{\left(\dfrac{4}{R^3(R+1)^2}\right)} = R.$$

In terms of φ,

$$\widetilde{h} = \frac{4+\varphi}{4-\varphi}.$$

Expanding this as a Taylor series in φ, we observe that it agrees with (5.3) up to the coefficient of φ^2.

The transverse curvature, which was defined as $r = 2\partial\overline{\partial}\varphi(\xi \wedge \overline{\xi})$, is

$$r = \frac{1-R^2}{8R}.$$

Note that r vanishes on the boundary. In terms of φ,

$$r = \frac{2\varphi}{\varphi^2 - 16}.$$

Observe that $r'|_S = -(1/8)$, agreeing with (5.1). We now get that

$$s = \frac{1}{256}(\varphi^2 - 16)^2$$

is the solution to the boundary-value problem (4.3).

Substituting the above formulae for $\widetilde{h}$ and s into the formula (4.4) for the volume form we get (7.3).

Let us now verify the renormalised Chern–Gauss–Bonnet formula in Corollary 1.2. Since Scal $\equiv 2, A \equiv 0$ and $V = 3\pi^2/16$, we have that the CR invariant $\mathcal{V}(S) = 1$. The Levi-Civita curvature matrix and hence Chern forms of the Bergman metric may be computed from (7.1). It turns out that $c_2 - (1/3)c_1^2 \equiv 0$. Since the Euler characteristic of the ball $\chi(B) = 1$, the verification is complete. Remark that this is moreover consistent with the value $\mu(S) = -1$ given for the Burns–Epstein invariant in [BE88].

Appendix A. CR Q-curvature

A straightforward adaptation of the method in [FG02] to our CR setting will lead to the proof of (1.2). We begin by recalling a result from that paper. To distinguish notation between the conformal and CR cases, bold characters are used in the former.

Theorem A.1 ([FG02, Theorem 3.1])**.** *Let $(\boldsymbol{M}, [\boldsymbol{g}])$ be a smooth compact conformal manifold of even dimension n'. Let $\boldsymbol{g}_+$ be the Poincaré metric on $\boldsymbol{X} := \boldsymbol{M} \times (-1, 0]$. Choose a representative metric $\boldsymbol{g}$ with special defining function ψ that satisfies $\psi^2\boldsymbol{g}_+|_{T\boldsymbol{M}} = \boldsymbol{g}$, $|d(\log(-\psi))|^2_{\boldsymbol{g}_+} = 1$. There is a unique solution $\boldsymbol{U}$ mod $O(\psi^{n'})$ to*

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{g}_+}\boldsymbol{U} = n' + O(\psi^{n'+1}\log(-\psi))$$

of the form

$$\boldsymbol{U} = \log(-\psi) + \boldsymbol{A} + \boldsymbol{B}\psi^{n'}\log(-\psi) + O(\psi^{n'})$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{B} \in C^\infty(\boldsymbol{X}), \quad \boldsymbol{A}|_{\boldsymbol{M}} = 0.$$

Also, $\boldsymbol{A}$ mod $O(\psi^{n'})$ and $\boldsymbol{B}|_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ are formally determined by $\boldsymbol{g}$.

The Q-curvature is then defined to be a constant multiple of of $\boldsymbol{B}|_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. It is further shown in [FG02] that the integral of this quantity is a constant multiple of the log term coefficient in the volume expansion of $(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{g}_+)$. Returning to CR geometry, we have the following analogue of Theorem A.1.

Proposition A.2. *Let M be a smooth compact strictly pseudoconvex CR manifold of dimension $2n+1$ that forms the boundary of a complex manifold X. Let g_+ be Fefferman's approximately Einstein metric on X near M. Choose any pseudohermitian structure θ for M and let φ be the special defining function associated to θ according to Lemma 3.1. There is a unique solution U mod $O(\varphi^{n+1})$ to*

$$\Delta_{g_+}U = 2(n+1) + O(\varphi^{n+2}\log(-\varphi))$$

of the form

$$U = \log(-\varphi) + A + B\varphi^{n+1}\log(-\varphi) + O(\varphi^{n+1})$$

with

$$A, B \in C^\infty(X), \quad A|_M = 0.$$

Also, A mod $O(\varphi^{n+1})$ and $B|_M$ are formally determined by θ.

Proof. In [GL88] the Kähler Laplacian Δ_{g_+} was decomposed into tangential and normal pieces with respect to the foliation $\{\rho = \varepsilon\}$, where ρ is a local solution to the Monge–Ampére problem (3.26). We, however, require a decomposition with respect to the foliation $\{M^\varepsilon\} = \{\varphi = \varepsilon\}$. To this end, we note that from the form (3.4) of g_+ we may write, for a function f on X,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{g_+} f &= -\Big((g^{-1})^{0\overline{0}}(D_{\widetilde{\xi}} D_{\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}} + D_{\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}} D_{\widetilde{\xi}}) + (g^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\beta}}(D_{W_\alpha} D_{W_{\overline{\beta}}} + D_{W_{\overline{\beta}}} D_{W_\alpha})\Big) f \\ &= -\Big(\varphi^2(D_{\widetilde{\xi}} D_{\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}} + D_{\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}} D_{\widetilde{\xi}}) - \varphi(\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\alpha\overline{\beta}}(D_{W_\alpha} D_{W_{\overline{\beta}}} + D_{W_{\overline{\beta}}} D_{W_\alpha})\Big) f.\end{aligned}$$

Now by the definition of covariant differentiation

$$\begin{aligned}D_{\widetilde{\xi}} D_{\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}} f &= \widetilde{\xi}\, \overline{\widetilde{\xi}} f - f_{\overline{\gamma}} \overline{\psi_0{}^{\gamma}{}_{\overline{0}}} - (\overline{\widetilde{\xi}} f)\overline{\psi_0{}^{0}{}_{\overline{0}}} \\ &= N^2 f + (r + \varphi^2|\eta|^2)Nf + Y_1 f,\end{aligned}$$

similarly,

$$D_{\overline{\widetilde{\xi}}} D_{\widetilde{\xi}} f = N^2 f + (r + \varphi^2|\eta|^2)Nf + Y_2 f,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}D_{W_\alpha} D_{W_{\overline{\beta}}} f &= (Nf)h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} + Y_3 f, \\ D_{W_{\overline{\beta}}} D_{W_\alpha} f &= (Nf)h_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} + Y_4 f,\end{aligned}$$

for tangential operators Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4. Collecting these formulae together we have that

$$\Delta_{g_+} = -2\varphi^2 N^2 - 2\varphi(\varphi r + \varphi^3|\eta|^2 - (\widetilde{h}^{-1})_\alpha{}^\alpha)N + \varphi Y, \tag{A.1}$$

where Y is a tangential operator.

The above formula implies that if $a_j \in C^\infty(M)$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{g_+}(a_j\varphi^j) &= -j(j-1)a_j\varphi^j + j(\widetilde{h}^{-1})_\alpha{}^\alpha a_j\varphi^j + O(\varphi^{j+1}) \\ &= -j(j-(n+1))a_j\varphi^j + O(\varphi^{j+1}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence by setting $a_0 = 0$ we can inductively determine $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ uniquely so that, taking $A = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j\varphi^j$, the function $\log(-\varphi) + A$ solves

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{g_+}(\log(-\varphi) + A) = n + 1 + E\varphi^{n+1}.$$

Here $E \in C^\infty(X)$ and $E|_M$ is formally determined by the pseudohermitian structure θ. From (A.1) it is easy to compute that if $B \in C^\infty(X)$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{g_+}(B\varphi^{n+1}\log(-\varphi)) = -(n+1)B\varphi^{n+1} + O(\varphi^{n+2}\log(-\varphi)). \tag{A.2}$$

So setting $B = \frac{1}{n+1}E$ completes the proof of the proposition, since the uniqueness assertion is clear from construction. □

Proposition A.3. *If L denotes the log term coefficient in the asymptotic expansion of the volume of (X, g_+) and B is as in Proposition A.2 then*

$$L = \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{2^{n+1}n!}\int_M B\ \theta \wedge (d\theta)^n.$$

Proof. One can check that the unit outward normal to each M^ε is $\sqrt{2}\varphi\mathrm{Re}\,\widetilde{\xi}$. Taking the function U from Proposition A.2, for a small negative number ε_0 Green's theorem gives

$$\int_{\varepsilon_0<\varphi<\varepsilon} \Delta_{g_+} U dv_+ = -\sqrt{2}\varepsilon\int_{M^\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Re}\,\widetilde{\xi})U + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon_0\int_{M^{\varepsilon_0}}(\mathrm{Re}\,\widetilde{\xi})U,$$

where the integrals on the right-hand side are with respect to the volume element induced on the each respective hypersurface. We want to compare coefficients of $\log(-\varepsilon)$ in this equation. By Proposition A.2 and (4.6) the coefficient of $\log(-\varepsilon)$ on the left-hand side is $2(n+1)L$. As for the right-hand side, only the first integral is relevant. We use our diffeomorphism F to pull this integral back to M. Together with the form of U given in Proposition A.2 and the expression for the volume element (4.5), this integral becomes

$$-\sqrt{2}\varepsilon\int_M \Big(\varepsilon^{-1} + (\mathrm{Re}\,\widetilde{\xi})A + (n+1)B\varepsilon^n\log(-\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^n)\Big)\times$$
$$\sqrt{2}\varepsilon^{-n-1}\Big(v^{(0)} + v^{(1)}\varepsilon + \cdots\Big)\,\theta\wedge(d\theta)^n.$$

The coefficient of $\log(-\varepsilon)$ in this expression is

$$-2\int_M (n+1)v^{(0)}B\;\theta\wedge(d\theta)^n,$$

which by (4.4) is

$$-\frac{(n+1)(-1)^n}{2^n n!}\int_M B\;\theta\wedge(d\theta)^n.$$

□

The definition of CR Q-curvature ([FH03]) uses the conformal structure of Fefferman [Fef76] mentioned in the Introduction. As all considerations are local we will assume that our strictly pseudoconvex pseudohermitian manifold (M,θ) is the boundary of a strictly pseudoconvex domain of $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Recall from [Fef76] that for a local solution ρ to Fefferman's Monge–Ampére problem (3.26) there is an associated Kähler–Lorentz metric $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{g}}$ on $\mathbb{C}^*\times X$, namely

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{g}} := \sum_{j,k=0}^{n+1}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^j\partial\overline{z}^k}(|z^0|^2\rho(z))dz^j d\overline{z}^k,$$

where $(z^0,z)\in\mathbb{C}\times X$. Denote by $\boldsymbol{g}$ the restriction of $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{g}}$ to

$$\boldsymbol{M} := S^1\times M = \{(z^0,z) : |z^0| = 1, z\in M\}.$$

The Lorentz conformal structure $(\boldsymbol{M},[\boldsymbol{g}])$ is known as Fefferman's conformal structure. In [Lee86], Lee showed that corresponding to any pseudohermitian structure θ is an element of the conformal class $[\boldsymbol{g}]$, call it $\boldsymbol{g}(\theta)$, satisfying $\boldsymbol{g}(e^{2\Upsilon}\theta) = e^{2\Upsilon}\boldsymbol{g}(\theta)$. In this formulation the distinguished representative $\boldsymbol{g}$ corresponds to the pseudohermitian structure $\mathrm{Im}\,\partial\rho|_{TM}$. The Q-curvature of the conformal structure $(\boldsymbol{M},[\boldsymbol{g}])$ turns out to be S^1-invariant and the *CR Q-curvature* Q^{CR} is defined to be its projection down to M.

If we apply Theorem A.1 (with $n' = 2(n+1)$) to Fefferman's conformal structure, then Q^{CR} is a constant multiple of $\boldsymbol{B}|_{S^1\times M}$. To relate this to

$B|_M$ from Proposition A.2 we need to compare the Poincaré Laplacian $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{g}_+}$ with the Kähler Laplacian Δ_{g_+}. The Poincaré metric $\boldsymbol{g}_+$ for the conformal structure $(\boldsymbol{M}, [\boldsymbol{g}])$ lives on $\boldsymbol{X} := S^1 \times X$ and it was shown in [FG85] that

$$\boldsymbol{g}_+ = g_+ - \left(d\lambda - \frac{i}{2}(\overline{\partial} - \partial)u \right)^2 ,$$

where λ is a coordinate on S^1 and $u := \log(-1/\rho)$. Let capital indices run from 0 to $2n+2$, with $\overline{j} = j+n+1$, and denote, e.g., $(\partial/\partial z^j)u$ by u_j. With this notation, $g_+ = \sum u_{j\overline{k}} dz^j d\overline{z}^k$. The matrix of $\boldsymbol{g}_+$ is

$$((\boldsymbol{g}_+)_{JK}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{4}u_j u_k & \frac{1}{2}u_{j\overline{k}} - \frac{1}{4}u_j u_{\overline{k}} & -\frac{i}{2}u_j \\ \frac{1}{2}u_{j\overline{k}} - \frac{1}{4}u_j u_{\overline{k}} & \frac{1}{4}u_{\overline{j}} u_{\overline{k}} & \frac{i}{2}u_{\overline{j}} \\ -\frac{i}{2}u_k & \frac{i}{2}u_{\overline{k}} & -1 \end{pmatrix} .$$

There is the following matrix factorisation:

$$((\boldsymbol{g}_+)_{JK}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \frac{i}{2}u_j \\ 1 & 1 & -\frac{i}{2}u_{\overline{j}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2}u_{j\overline{k}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}u_{j\overline{k}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{i}{2}u_k & -\frac{i}{2}u_{\overline{k}} & 1 \end{pmatrix} .$$

From this we can compute the inverse matrix

$$((\boldsymbol{g}_+{}^{-1})^{JK}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2(u^{-1})^{j\overline{k}} & i(u^{-1})^{j\overline{l}}u_{\overline{l}} \\ 2(u^{-1})^{j\overline{k}} & 0 & -i(u^{-1})^{l\overline{j}}u_l \\ i(u^{-1})^{k\overline{l}}u_{\overline{l}} & -i(u^{-1})^{l\overline{k}}u_l & -1 + (u^{-1})^{l\overline{m}}u_l u_{\overline{m}} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{A.3}$$

where $(u^{-1})^{j\overline{k}}$ denotes the components of the inverse matrix of $(u_{j\overline{k}})$. If $\boldsymbol{D}$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of $\boldsymbol{g}_+$, then the Poincaré Laplacian is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{g}_+} = -(\boldsymbol{g}_+{}^{-1})^{JK} \boldsymbol{D}_{\partial_J} \boldsymbol{D}_{\partial_K} .$$

On the other hand, the Kähler Laplacian is

$$\Delta_{g_+} = -2(u^{-1})^{j\overline{k}} \partial_j \partial_{\overline{k}} .$$

After computing Christoffel symbols using the formulae above for $\boldsymbol{g}_+$ and its inverse, it turns out that

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{g}_+} \equiv 2\Delta_{g_+} \mod \partial_\lambda . \tag{A.4}$$

Using (A.3), the definition of ψ in Theorem A.1 and Lee's correspondence mentioned above, it follows that if φ is considered as a defining function for $S^1 \times M$ by extending trivially in the S^1 direction, then $\psi = -\sqrt{-\varphi}$. Furthermore, if the function U from Proposition A.2 is considered as a function on $\boldsymbol{X}$ by extending trivially in the S^1 direction, then (A.4) and Proposition A.2 imply that

$$\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{g}_+} U = n' + O(\psi^{n'+1} \log(-\psi)).$$

By the uniqueness assertion of Theorem A.1 we conclude that

$$U = 2\boldsymbol{U} + O(\psi^{n'}),$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}\log(-\varphi) + A + B\varphi^{n+1}\log(-\varphi) &= 2(\log(-\psi) + \boldsymbol{A} + \boldsymbol{B}\psi^{n'}\log(-\psi)) + O(\psi^{n'}) \\ &= \log(-\varphi) + 2\boldsymbol{A} + \boldsymbol{B}\varphi^{n+1}\log(-\varphi) + O(\varphi^{n+1}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence the trivial extension of $B|_M$ to $S^1 \times M$ is precisely $\boldsymbol{B}|_{S^1\times M}$. We have thus proved (1.2).

REFERENCES

[And01] M. T. Anderson, *L^2 curvature and volume renormalization of AHE metrics on 4-manifolds*, Math. Res. Lett. **8** (2001), 171–188.

[BE88] D. Burns and C. L. Epstein, *A global invariant for three dimensional CR-manifolds*, Invent. Math. **92** (1988), 333–348.

[BE90] D. Burns and C. L. Epstein, *Characteristic numbers of bounded domains*, Acta Math. **164** (1990), 29–71.

[BH05] O. Biquard and M. Herzlich, *A Burns-Epstein invariant for ACHE 4-manifolds*, Duke Math. J. **126** (2005), 53–100.

[Che45] S. S. Chern, *On the curvatura integra in a Riemannian manifold*, Ann. of Math. **46** (1945), 674–684.

[CY80] S. Y. Cheng and S. T. Yau, *On the existence of a complete Kähler metric on non-compact complex manifolds and the regularity of Fefferman's equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **33** (1980), 507–544.

[Fef76] C. Fefferman, *Monge–Ampére equations, the Bergman kernel, and the geometry of pseudoconvex domains*, Ann. of Math. **103** (1976), 395–416, correction: **104** (1976), 393–394.

[FG85] C. Fefferman and C. R. Graham, *Conformal invariants*, Élie Cartan et les mathématiques d'aujord'hui, Astérisque, Numero Hors Serie, 1985, pp. 95–116.

[FG02] C. Fefferman and C. R. Graham, *Q-curvature and Poincaré metrics*, Math. Res. Lett. **9** (2002), 139–151.

[FH03] C. Fefferman and K. Hirachi, *Ambient metric construction of Q-curvature in conformal and CR geometries*, Math. Res. Lett. **10** (2003), 819–831.

[GL88] C. R. Graham and J. M. Lee, *Smooth solutions of degenerate Laplacians on strictly pseudoconvex domains*, Duke Math. J. **57** (1988), 697–720.

[Gra00] C. R. Graham, *Volume and area renormalizations for conformally compact Einstein metrics*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) Suppl. **63** (2000), 31–42.

[Her] M. Herzlich, *A remark on renormalized volume and Euler characteristic for ACHE 4-manifolds*, preprint, `arXiv:math.DG/0305134`.

[Hir92] K. Hirachi, *Scalar pseudo-hermitian invariants and the Szegö kernel on three-dimensional CR manifolds*, Complex Geometry, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., vol. 143, Dekker, 1992, pp. 67–76.

[HS98] M. Henningson and K. Skenderis, *The holographic Weyl anomaly*, J. High Energy Phys. (1998), no. 7, paper 23.

[Lee86] J. M. Lee, *The Fefferman metric and pseudohermitian invariants*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **296** (1986), 411–429.

[Lee88] J. M. Lee, *Pseudo-Einstein structures on CR manifolds*, Amer. J. Math **110** (1988), 157–178.

[Tan75] N. Tanaka, *A differential study on strongly pseudo-convex manifolds*, Lectures in Mathematics, Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, no. 9, Kinokuniya Book-Store Co., Ltd., 1975.

[Web78] S. M. Webster, *Pseudohermitian structures on a real hypersurface*, J. Differential Geom. **13** (1978), 25–41.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
3–8–1 KOMABA, MEGURO, TOKYO 153–8914, JAPAN
E-mail address: `seshadri@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp`